THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

SHOULD the Church interfere with politics?' is a question constantly raised, and answered in different ways. Herr Gerhard LEIBHOLZ answers it clearly and definitely in *Christianity, Politics and Power* (Sheldon Press; 1s. 6d. net). But, first of all, a word about the writer. Dr. Leonard Hodgson, who introduces him and his book, tells us that he first met him at a Conference and was struck by a contribution he made. Later he discovered that Herr LEIBHOLZ was a distinguished scholar of high standing, in more than one German university, whose studies lay in the field of jurisprudence and political science. Also, he was a member of the Lutheran Church and a convinced Christian. Dr. Hodgson introduced him to Oxford, where he lectured with such acceptance that it was generally felt that the lectures he gave should be published. Hence their appearance as a Christian News-Letter Book.

The main thesis he puts forward is that the Church itself must be political, and even highly political, and that the Christian faith is of incalculable political value. Only in this way will the Church be a creative force in the world. The position in which the churches find themselves to-day is the result, not of the fact that they have interfered in the affairs of the State, but that they have pursued a political line which is not in accord with Christian principles. And the inevitable duty of the Church is to find a way to undo the harm that has been done.

Herr LEIBHOLZ contends that the main task of the Church is to see that the fundamental teaching of Christian faith and Christian morality controls the life of the nations. It is powerfully and repeatedly to press into national and international life Christian principles such as the sacredness of human personality, the sovereignty of God over all nations, the universal brotherhood of men. It is to provide the necessary motives, standards of value and conceptions of life until all private and public affairs come under the control of God and the earthly life becomes a colony of heaven. There is no sphere of life which may refuse this claim of the Church to apply the principles of the Christian gospel.

This is what Herr LEIBHOLZ calls Christian Totalitarianism. All political questions, he contends, are religious, even theological. The Church has a total attitude to the whole of life. And therefore its claim must be totalitarian. It is only possible to re-order human life by the power of the word of God if the Church ceases to live in self-contained seclusion and to limit her activities to the proclamation of the gospel. There is, at bottom, room for only two views, the one just described or the view that Christianity has nothing to do with politics and has more or less to withdraw from the world, and to take on, in the long run, a purely other-worldly attitude.

But the latter view leaves the way open for the contention that moral principles do not apply to the State. This was the view of Hegel, of Treitschke and (of course) of Nietzsche. And it is the view on which National Socialism in Germany has proceeded. It desires nothing better than that there should be a clear division between State and Church, so that political duty should be reserved to the State and that the Church limit itself to purely spiritual matters and to preparing people for another world. National Socialism is realistic enough to see that the day of Christianity as a political creative world force has passed if God can be shut out from human life to-day.

What true Christianity claims is that such an other-worldly attitude, and limitation of the dominion of Christ to the inner world, completely misrepresents the task of the Church, and in its practical effect is exactly what secular Totalitarianism demands of the churches. An unpolitical faith which refuses to have anything to do with secular affairs is to-day a dead faith. It enables State Totalitarianism to put God and His commandments aside.

The final issue at stake to-day is between Christianity and Paganism. The only way of avoiding the acceptance of a pagan and completely secular society is—'as far as I can see'—a conception of life based on the rediscovery of the fundamental values and creative forces of Christianity which must take on, in the revolutionary

period we are living through, a spiritual challenging and revolutionary character. If it is not possible to bring into being the political totalitarian claims of the Church in the national and international life and to make Christian spirit and principles the dominating spiritual force of the New Order to come, then the efforts to equip Western democracy for its struggle against secular Totalitarianism will end in the subversion of this democracy itself to such a kind of Totalitarianism.

There is hope of better things, because the Church has what no other organization has, real unity, real authority (that of a Divine creed) and a real total view of life and attitude to its problems. But if the Church is to achieve its great aim, the Christianizing of all life, national and international, it must be, in fundamental things, a transformed Church. In the end all depends on whether the Church can take on the revolutionary character the situation demands.

The weakness of the Church has manifested itself more in its general political and social than in its theological aspects. The Church has not been true to herself because she has been too little, and not too much, politically minded. Through fear of intermingling religion with politics the churches have frequently acquiesced in a wrong course taken by the State. They have bound themselves too much to the ruling social system, with its manifold wrongs. Thus they have been largely identified with the old-established political and social order and class-ridden society. Only if the Church is vital enough to bridge the gap which separates her from the world to-day, and especially from the masses who have deserted institutional religion, will she be able to realize her obvious destiny and justify her totalitarian claims.

Several editions of Pascal's *Pensées* have appeared in recent years. The aim of the editors has been so to rearrange the material, which was left in unsystematized form, as to bring out the true order of Pascal's reflections. In the volume before us, *Pascal's Apology for Religion*, by the Rev. H. F. STEWART, D.D. (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net), the attempt is made not to rearrange the whole material but to select and arrange what is relevant to Pascal's apologetic position.

The leading clue is provided by an apologetic lecture, which Pascal delivered three or four years before his death, of which a detailed account was preserved by Filleau de la Chaise. This lecture Dr. STEWART has carefully studied, and in the light of it he has set the *Pensées* in a new order, omitting all that did not appear to have any bearing upon the argument so far set forth in the lecture.

Dr. STEWART, who has already shown himself to be an authority on Pascal, has published in this volume a 'conjectural syllabus' of Pascal's apologetic lecture ('*De vera religione*'). The various items of the syllabus form the titles of the groups of selections from the *Pensées*, and the selections are given in the original French. In addition, he has offered in broad outline a summary of the Apology as he discovers it in the pages of the lecture, and for which he seeks support amid the chaos of the *Pensées*.

Many of our readers may find it both interesting and helpful to gain an impression of the contents of Pascal's *Apology*. Accordingly, in what follows we offer to them excerpts from Dr. STEWART'S summary, while at the same time seeking to preserve coherence of form.

Pascal's object was to awaken men to the call of the heart, prepare the way for knowledge of God, belief in Him, and desire for Him. For this purpose are needed, not metaphysical arguments, but a statement of facts, moral and historical, an appeal to intuitive feeling and practical experience.

His *Apology* falls into two main parts: man's misery apart from God, his happiness with God.

Pascal takes as subject a free-thinker, one who has never thought about God or his own destiny, who lives for present pleasure, lapped in indifference as to the future. Pascal makes him look into the glass. It is not a pleasing picture. When the free-thinker is thoroughly alarmed by what he sees, Pascal shows him another picture—man's gift of thought, awareness of his misery, desire for good, desire for truth. The result is a hopeless mixture of incompatible elements.

The free-thinker cannot but admit the general accuracy of the descriptions. But where to find light and peace? Not with the philosophers, not with the religions of the world, but with the Jews, whose story is told in a wonderful book, which by its coherence and unity compels belief. Further, it tells the story, not only of the Jews, but of humanity—man made in the image of God, as like to Him as the finite can be to the infinite.

Pascal shows how the likeness was lost through

man's first disobedience; how the Fall and its sinister consequences are the burden of the Bible, the only book which paints man as he was and as he is; the only one which explains the present bondage of the Soul, promises a cure for our ills, and a Redeemer from our sin and misery.

But one consideration holds the free-thinker back—the unreasonableness and injustice of the doctrine. Reason! cries Pascal. Be thankful that in a matter of such moment you are not at the mercy of human reason which so often fails you in judging trifles. And as for justice and injustice, our notions of them are purely human, born of custom, local and temporal practice, and no measure of the eternal justice of Almighty God.

Pascal proceeds to establish the authority of the two Testaments upon which the Christian religion stands. The mere history of the Jews is itself a witness to Christ; but the main witness is Prophecy. Inspired seers foretold the fortunes and misfortunes of the race; and they spoke so clearly of Jesus Christ, with such exact detail, that they are His historians as much as the Evangelists themselves. Jesus is the fulfilment of prophecy and type, the universal Redeemer. Even if there were no prophecies and no miracles to support His claim to our allegiance, the paradox of His Person and the beauty of His life and teaching declare His divinity and the truth about God.

Proofs of this only reach the mind through the heart. You may know geometry by the exercise of reason; you cannot know God save through Jesus Christ, who speaks to the heart. It is to compel the appeal to the heart that God veiled Himself, and so blended light and darkness that the heart is needed for the discernment of the truth.

The obstacles to belief are really few. There is the prejudice which bids us refuse everything save that which the mind can grasp without difficulty. And there are the passions which lead us captive. These obstacles must be surmounted, primarily by recognizing that there are many things which we accept, though we do not understand them. Why not use the heart in this grave matter of religion as you already do in things of everyday life?

How hard it is to preserve in our systems of thought the perfect balance of revealed truth, and how precarious are the doctrines which by human logic are deduced from it! How often it has happened that one great doctrine has dominated Christian thinking for a season to the practical exclusion of some other aspect of the truth. There was a time when the sovereignty of God was so dominant in theology that too little room was left for the doctrine of His love. To-day the pendulum has swung to the other side. The love of God holds the supreme place in Christian thinking—and what doctrine has a better right? But when men, having gained a grasp of that great truth, begin to argue as to what is and what is not compatible with the love of God there is grave danger of error. No one can be blind to the fact that to-day there are systems of Christian thought, professedly based on the love of God, which are more sentimental than Christian and which fail to do justice to the more robust elements of revealed truth.

These reflections are suggested by the reading of *Retribution and the Christian*, by Stephen Hobhouse, which appeared originally in the 'Hibbert Journal' and is now reprinted in enlarged form by the Fellowship of Reconciliation (2d.). It is written in answer to Archbishop Temple's doctrine of 'just retribution' as distinct from vengeance.

In the view of the Archbishop just retribution is 'a form of personal activity proper to God, who is Love, to Christ, and to the Christian, a form of Justice prompted by holy or "righteous" anger at sins of violence and cruelty; it expresses itself by the infliction of suffering and loss in some degree proportionate to the wrong done, and is justified as the true expression of love and loyalty not only to God and to goodness and to the victims of aggression, but equally also to the wrong-doers'.

To this doctrine Mr. Hobhouse is fundamentally opposed. He finds support for his view in various fields of human experience, but 'it is based fundamentally on a deep-seated, persistent intuition, glimpsed at least by some of the great Christian mystics and thinkers of the past, that the infliction of punitive suffering, with the "righteous wrath" that is said to underlie it, is not an activity of the God revealed by Jesus, considered *as a Person*; it cannot be harmonized with His Love or with true Justice, which looks unvaryingly not backward to past sin and guilt, but forward to the ultimate healing and salvation of the sinner, to his restoration to his "just" place in the reunited family of God.'

In support of this it is argued that '*retribution is an impersonal, cosmic activity of God considered as Law* and as the Principle of cause and effect, both material and moral, as the First Cause of the particular law by which sin produces suffering and loss as well as more sin, when left to itself. . . . It is as such that He is pictured in the stern Judge or Monarch of some of the parables of Jesus.' This, of course, is in line with the views of some modern writers who picture the love of God as pure softness, but surely it is beyond the limits of fair exegesis to maintain that when Jesus spoke of God as Father He meant a person but when He spoke of God as King and Judge He only meant 'an impersonal cosmic activity.' It is not too much to say that such a distinction could never have entered the mind of any Biblical writer.

The practical consequence of the distinction thus drawn is that 'if Christians become the agents of His impersonal Law of consequence, they are then acting, not as followers or "imitators" of Christ, but, in Scriptural language, as pagan "rods" or "axes" of Jehovah, as "ministers of wrath;" and by so endeavouring to operate the impersonal law which it is not for them to administer, and to inflict upon the evil-doer additional punishments of their own devising, they become themselves involved in the sin and all its fatal complex of consequence.' The only proper Christian activity towards evil is that of forbearance and love while the incurable elements perish by their own inherent rottenness. 'The worst elements of an evil society are dissolved by the processes of decay and self-destructive conflict. So, as has often been remarked, the revolution of violence, after having devoured the bad old regime, then proceeds to "devour its own children," leaving the way open for a milder and more constructive government.' Doubtless in all evil there are seeds of decay and death, but it may be gravely doubted whether evil, left unchecked, would thus liquidate itself in time. The experiment is never likely to be tried in this world, for evil has been held in check and punished from the earliest times and is pretty certain to be so to the end. Those, therefore, who under the ægis of a settled government indulge in speculations as to how the course of unchecked evil would run are never likely to have their theories put to the proof.

It is the view of Mr. HOBHOUSE that 'retribution, however "just," is not conducive to human welfare.' In support of this he argues that 'the infliction of retributive suffering by a fellow-creature almost invariably stirs up the resentment and pride of a man habituated to evil ways and thus degrades and brutalizes him still further.' But granting that there may be much truth in this, does it quite cover the case? When 'human welfare' is spoken of it must be held to include much besides the feelings and reaction of the evil-doer. It is at least arguable that retribution conduces to human welfare by its deterrent influence on other possible wrong-doers and the consequent safe-guarding of their victims.

It would be a mistake, however, to regard Mr. HOBHOUSE as an extreme Pacifist. On the contrary he fully realizes the difficult problem of the 'extent to which the community, or at least the Christian members of it, should continue to employ, in the interests of social order and justice, the apparently indispensable but in many respects demoralizing methods of preventive or restraining violence in arresting and isolating, with a view to their "re-education," the gang of criminal law-breakers or the nation led by an aggressive Government.' This problem he declines at the moment to discuss, but his statement of the problem would appear to bring him a long step in the direction of the Archbishop's policy. Were the two to meet and discuss what practical means should be taken for 'arresting and isolating, with a view to their re-education' the present gang of wrong-doers, it is very likely they would reach an agreed policy. For doubtless the Archbishop would propose nothing that could not be done in Christian good-will, and Mr. HOBHOUSE could safeguard his principle by saying, 'Don't call it retributive.'

All the churches at the moment are deeply concerned about the question of religious instruction in the schools. And not before time. The situation was undeniably dangerous, how dangerous the Youth Movement in Germany under Nazi auspices has unmistakably revealed. Everybody knows that religious instruction in our schools, with, one is glad to acknowledge, some exceptional but far too few cases, is almost non-existent. It usually ceases altogether in the upper classes, just at the dawn of adolescence which is the golden time for thirling a heart to religion. There was no room for it in the time-table.

We were all realizing too that unless young people were brought into touch with religion in the day-school, a multitude of them would only accidentally find touch with it at all. For the

number of children receiving instruction in Sunday School or in pious homes was patently rapidly diminishing. What is to be done about it ?

In a booklet entitled *A Parson's Politics* (James Clarke ; 1s. 6d. net) Canon A. E. Simpson of Chester has wise and weighty words to say on the topic of religion in the schools. He writes primarily of England ; but what he has to say both of the problem and its solution is quite relevant to Scotland.

To begin with he indicates what is fundamentally wrong with our educational system. 'It seems clear,' he says, 'that in any better order which may be created after the war there must be included a better educational system.' We have not a first-rate system now. We have had seventy years of State-managed education but have not become an educated nation. We are missing the mark of producing intelligent and well-educated youth.

He suggests that this may be because we have never cleared up our minds as to what our educational aim is. What are we educating children for, to help them to have a certain type of character or just to equip them for a job of some kind ? Our theories are pitched high, but in practice we seem to be aiming just at so equipping a boy with knowledge that he will secure a good job, better paid than his father's. The public seem to value education just because it is the door either to social advance or to more money. So we fit children to do well for themselves. This is the really operative ideal—self-interest, and the idea of duty is well in the background.

Manifestly, if this is true, the situation is grave. No better society will ever flourish among people who put self-interest first. The lack of an adequate sense of duty to the community is a serious defect of modern democracy. Lack of public spirit is the cause of all that system's defects.

A better educational system then must aim at producing young people who put duty high and self-interest low, who ask not how much can I get out of life, but how much can I put into it ? And this sense of responsibility will not be awakened unless we can arouse a sense of responsibility to God. Ethical teaching will accomplish little unless it be based on religious teaching. For the great majority of men, if religion goes, or is not present, morality droops. Religious faith of some kind is necessary if self-interest and self-pleasing are not to dominate.

Things will not come right if we mean by religious instruction no more than Bible knowledge. No amount of knowledge of the Bible constitutes the knowledge of a religion. There is the same difference between the two as lies between a heap of bricks and a house. A child may know a great many of the Bible stories but that does not give him a religion. For religion he needs a definite, however simple, faith in God, a sufficient knowledge of his duty to God and to his fellows, and a habit of prayer—the source of Divine help in doing his duty.

Religious instruction then should base itself at all points on the Bible, and embrace teaching the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. That, we observe, is just the old traditional curriculum. Canon Simpson desiderates that following the Decalogue the 'Duties' (to God and my neighbour) of the Anglican Catechism should be thoroughly taught.

Perusal of this thoughtful and thought-provoking chapter will strengthen our conviction that we have few needs so urgent in Scotland as a School Catechism, as Dr. Hutcheson Cockburn and others have been urging. The Shorter Catechism everybody feels will not do. It is too elaborate and its language too technical and abstruse. It covers the ground Canon Simpson regards as necessary—Creed, Moral Law, Lord's Prayer, but it contains a great deal more than young children require or can begin to understand.

Reconstruction Problems.

XIV. The Conditions of Freedom in Society.

By the Reverend Stewart Mechie, M.A., Edinburgh.

The phrase 'planning for freedom' is commonly used to sum up the present task of post-war democratic leadership; and it is the purpose of this essay to consider conditions which must be fulfilled if freedom is to be preserved in the midst of modern social planning.

A passage from the *Christian News Letter No. 145* may serve as introduction. The writer, who is described as a 'lifelong student of sociology and public affairs', says, 'The great danger of the present situation is not only, as Professor Mannheim emphasizes, that the technical structures of modern society invite and often almost compel the modern State to exceed its functions and encroach upon the freedom of its subjects. Its subjects, in reaction against the limitations which thus diminish their autonomy, tend usually to react in a manner likely to worsen their situation. The demands which are being framed by so many groups and movements, for large economic improvements, for the reform of international arrangements, for "social justice," universal education and even world-organization—all these demands for the reordering of affairs upon the largest scale, without explicit indication as to who should carry it out, are implicit invitation to the State to assume more and more comprehensive functions and to override any local centres of initiative that may remain . . . the first line of defence against the menace of the "omni-competent State" is not to join in demands for more things to be put in its power, nor to agitate for anything which is really outside the functions of a State but, in present circumstances, could only be undertaken by the State.' No one who bears in mind the trend of legislation in this country within living memory will say that this is an idle warning. It appears that 'planning for freedom' is a deceptively simple description of something so difficult that those who undertake it may easily, for lack of insight, find themselves destroying the thing they set out to promote.

1. *Freedom demands a proper relation between society and the natural world.* It is vain for man to plan his society if he misunderstands or misuses that natural environment which alone makes it possible for society to exist at all in this world. The first principle of any society ought to be responsibility for the region which it inhabits, for its use without impoverishment and if possible for its improvement as a heritage to be handed on to posterity. This is quite fundamental; but, since it formed the topic of the third essay in the present series, we depart from it now, only taking leave to quote from a recent thorough discussion of the whole subject: 'At present man has a notion of himself in which he features as an arbitrary manipulator—one who is entitled to interfere in the surface of the earth and the kingdom of life without check or hindrance. When man recognizes a general responsibility towards what I have called the initiative of Nature, and when, along with this, he recognizes that manipulation is only justified under the control and direction of the general pattern of Nature, it is reasonable to suppose that the social initiative will take a very different form. . . . We have to understand that life has its own disciplines which are greater than any man: that these disciplines are of archetypal proportions and contain within themselves the fertility of the forest and the vegetative control of the great watersheds: and that man has, in his intelligence, a faculty for apprehending these disciplines and, in his liberty, the beginnings of the conditions which nurture that apprehension: whereas the machine is no more than an instrument of human life to be used within these disciplines. We have also to recognize with humility that these—the principles of potential peace—are not the description of contemporary British virtues. On the contrary, the way of life to which they point is not yet our way; we can only reach it by renunciation.'[1] Since Nature is, equally with man, God's creature, to get right with Nature is part of what it means to get right with God. Woe to any planning which, ignoring this truth, initiates or continues forms of exploitation which cause deterioration in the natural environment of society.

2. *Freedom demands the reversal of the trend towards a centralized pyramid order of society.* There is obviously a menace to freedom in an order of society which can be fairly represented by a pyramid and where power and initiative, being increasingly lodged at the apex, proceed thence downwards to the lower strata. What is often overlooked, however, is that many schemes, in theory freedom-loving, would if carried out

[1] K. E. Barlow, *The Discipline of Peace*, 212 f.

result in such a pyramid order of society. Take, for instance, the Communist slogan 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.' The intention is Christian, but when one contemplates the principle in action one is faced with the question, Who is to decide what are each man's abilities and what are his needs? Society in general is incapable of considering such a question. In practice the decision must lie with a small group, say of psychological experts. But who is to decide what type of ability constitutes one a psychological expert? And who is to test the expert's disinterestedness? *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* The principle, once it descends into the arena as a practical reform, demands some small group at the apex or some bureaucratic group lower down to which power has been delegated for the purpose. Here lies the weakness, from the point of view of freedom, of schemes of public ownership. They tend to promote the pyramid order of society while seeming to do the reverse. The ownership of a large industry may become nominally nation-wide; but in fact the control under modern conditions is likely to fall into the hands of a small group of administrators who, just because they are remote from each local focus of the industry and are armed with the prestige of the State, may be less open to public criticism than the old shareholders and managers were. The tendency of all large-scale enterprises is toward absentee control and power without responsibility, and the public ownership of such enterprises may mean little more than putting them into the people's hands metaphorically while the real benefit and control remain as distant as before.

Consider from the same point of view another feature of current discussion, the widespread acceptance of the view that national sovereignty or even nations must be abolished. Advanced thinkers seem to be willing to see the ironing-out of national variety and the merging of mankind in a world mass with a world police force to keep order. This looks too like one gigantic servile state to be attractive to many, but to others its appeal is idealistic, for this seems to be the price of peace. Nationalism, it is said, leads to war; the obvious way to peace is the abolition of nations or, at any rate, of sovereign nation-states. But here again lurks the danger of centralized control from the apex of the pyramid. Who is wise or good enough to be entrusted with such powers? Moreover, is it true that nationalism necessarily leads to war? Is there not confusion here between political effects and financial-economic causes? Some would trace the aggressiveness of modern nationalism back through the bitter struggle for export markets to the supposed necessity of a 'favourable' balance of trade and so to the 'canons of sound finance,' which have no natural necessity but are man-made conventions. May it not be that the interests of freedom demand the increase and not the diminution of nation-states? If there were such a relation between society and Nature as we have desiderated above, there would be a balance between agriculture and industry, and the acuteness of the export struggle would be abated. In these circumstances the nation-state and the group within it would possess a new initiative and freedom. There is such a thing as a regional patriotism, which is only another name for a natural nationalism; hence groups of different language and culture within the present states might agree to separate as Norway and Sweden did. No doubt advanced thinkers will be shocked at the idea of increasing the number of nation-states. Let them consider that a large family is not necessarily less peaceful than a small one. Large or small, the family is likely to be peaceful if the individual members of it are balanced integrated personalities who do not need to vent their complexes and frustrations on the other members in the form of spites and tempers. Even so the number of nation-states in the world is of minor importance compared with the necessity that each should be able to live at home without internal frustrations and strains that must find relief at the expense of other nations, and so should be able to enter into co-operative relations with them, each enriching the others by its distinctive contribution. Freedom for the individual and democratic control of the executive are more easily realized in many small states than in one world state or federation.

There is great scope, too, for decentralization of initiative within each nation-state. Few things are more contrary to a Christian valuation of man than the idea of the proletariat, a mass of dispossessed people selling their labour like any other commodity and being transferred from district to district at the will of an administrator. Men and women should be members of the religious, cultural, social and economic institutions of the region which they inhabit, and should be enabled by their training to feel that they have the rights and responsibilities of their position within these corporate activities. The facilitating of new associations of people who have a common interest or tradition is a step towards freedom in the sense of being a barrier to the omnicompetence of the State. The Christian, mindful of the interests of freedom, will be suspicious of a cosmopolitanism which involves centralization of power and initiative; whereas he will be prejudiced in favour of anything that tends towards decentralization and the exercise of initiative from below upwards.

3. *Freedom demands an understanding and observance of the respective rights of society and its technicians and administrators.* The means of moulding the mentality of peoples have been so increased and perfected in the last generation that it is more than ever essential that society should have prompt and full control of those who are entrusted with executive authority. On the other hand, nothing is so calculated to discredit democracy as to invite the people to usurp the place of the expert and decide on matters of technique. Democracy is often said to be government by the people, but, except possibly in the smallest of city states, no people could possibly govern itself. Is it then government by the elected representatives of the people? Again a small state is required and, when technical questions are involved, the representatives may be as useless as the people themselves. If one says that democracy is government in accord with the will of the people one indicates the true function of the people in democracy, to express its will and demand the results it wishes. It is for the people to elect representatives to convey their demand for certain results to the administrators and technicians, and to pillory those who fail to produce the results demanded. The latter point is important, for nothing is so likely to rehabilitate democracy as the revival in every sphere of public life of personal responsibility, the principle that officials and leaders must bear the praise or blame of their acts or lack of acts. The results demanded may not always be for the good of the people, but that, in a democratic order, is no reason why the people's representatives or the technicians should prove recalcitrant. If they cannot conscientiously fulfil their instructions they should resign and endeavour to change the popular will. This is not to make the people's voice the voice of God: it is simply to affirm the democratic faith which is based on the Christian valuation of man.

4. *Freedom demands an income-empowered leisure.* There are signs that this is to be the focus of the social struggle in the post-war years, always assuming that the war ends before civilization is utterly shattered. On the one hand there stand a great company who cannot conceive any existence for the great mass of their fellow-men save total employment, the social structure of the ant-heap, with work for the sake of work, or work for the sake of keeping the people out of mischief. On the other hand there are those who point out that power-production and the machine have destroyed the basis of the work-state, so that not only is income-empowered leisure possible for all but also that without it peace is impossible. In a power-production age, it is said, you can have work and war or leisure and peace, but not work and peace. A writer in *Christendom*, September 1942, criticizing the orthodox view that upon the indefinite expansion of production the welfare of mankind depends, remarks truly: 'But expansion so considered is not wrong because it unfortunately provokes conflict, but because it is not a true assessment of the economic task any more than is "full employment." A planned international economy of production and exchange . . . may or may not avoid war which has hitherto been the end-product of "expansion"; but so long as it assumes the necessity for expansion without end and takes it as its mission and its business to promote this, it will continue to impose, upon an ever-increasing scale, the false dogmas of the idolatry of the economic.' Moreover without leisure and an income for the individual, whether employed or not, there can be no freedom in society. Supporters of this view point out that the principal factor in the current production of wealth is not any contemporary contribution, whether of labour or capital, but is the cultural inheritance of the race, the accumulation of all the inventions and improved processes from the time of the unknown ancient who invented the wheel and Archimedes with his lever down to Edison and Marconi, and including the good farmers who built up the fertility of the soil, and the humble workmen who saw a better way of doing an old job. Every human being alive to-day is the rightful heir of that accumulated inheritance: hence a basic income for all, whether they are required for current production or not, is both expedient—for machines that get no wages cannot buy their own products—and just; while those who may be needed for current production are due a wage or salary as well as their basic income. Personal property is a condition of freedom: and the most convenient form of property is a money-income, given not as a charity but as a right, and based on the physical facts of the cultural and technical progress of the race. To refuse modern men and women all income save charity or what they may be able to earn is fraud, the withholding of their rightful heritage.

The field is set here for a sociological battle of the first importance. Where should the Christian take his stand? To the present writer it seems clear that he should be nearer to the champions of income-empowered leisure than to those of total employment. Salvation by economic stress is not a Christian doctrine. The same temper of mind which of old denied all men free access to God's free grace, and insisted on their first bearing the burden of Jewish legalism, is now revealing itself in those who would deny men access to God's bounty in Nature and in the

cultural inheritance of the ages unless they first acquire merit by bearing the burden of finding and engaging in gainful employment, even though that employment consists in overcoming other people's sales-resistance. In the modern instance as in the ancient there is a show of fervent zeal for morality hiding a large admixture of pride, partly the pride which rebels at every man's being put in the same position as a hitherto privileged class, and partly the pride which cannot bear to realize that it has nothing which it has not received, but would like to stand on a basis of work done in the presence of the Creator of all. This is not morality or religion: it is perverted moralism. Leisure need not mean a soul-destroying idleness, and income-empowered leisure need not mean riot and excess. It is for the educators of society, and those especially who bear the name of Him who called His disciples to consider the lilies, to teach the new generation how to use leisure wisely in a power-production age by letting economic activities sink into their properly subordinate place in man's interests, and transferring the struggle of life to the cultural and spiritual planes.

5. *Freedom demands the maintenance of the Christian valuation of man.* This has been so rightly emphasized in recent discussion that little need be said of it. Perhaps it is not superfluous, however, to recall that the Church is the teacher and guardian of that valuation. Where it is accepted and taught by outsiders there is a danger that it may be subtly perverted, so that man the hell-deserving sinner for whom the Son of God did not disdain to die may become the brutish sensual creature whose nose must be kept to the grindstone lest he should get out of hand, or, on the other hand, the rational creature whose sins are really ignorance. To hold the Christian valuation of man in practice means to walk along a knife edge, and only the Church possessed of the Word of God can do it for long.

Literature.

A LIFE OF JESUS.

Despite the formidable difficulties set in the way of the historian by the textual and literary criticism of the Gospels the writing of Lives of Jesus still goes on. The author of the volume under review, *Jesus in the Light of History* (Scribner's; 10s. 6d. net), is well aware of the difficulties. But he has faced them courageously, and is satisfied that his new portrait of Jesus bears all the marks of authenticity. Indeed he makes a claim for it which most of us would regard as overbold: 'At long last, Jesus makes His own appearance in the full light of history.'

The author is Dr. A. T. Olmstead, Professor of Oriental History at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Hitherto his historical output has been in fields cognate to Old Testament studies: the history of Palestine and Syria and the history of Assyria. In the course of his researches he has spent much time in the Holy Land and taken a keen interest in its antiquities; and it was altogether natural that he should be led on to the task of writing a Life of Jesus, especially as he is well qualified on the linguistic side to appreciate the language behind the Greek Gospels.

His vivid pages reflect the knowledge of one who has studied the Gospel incidents 'on the spot,' and a special feature—for which many readers will be grateful—is the account of the Jerusalem of Jesus' day embodying the results of recent excavations. As for the language problem in Gospel criticism, he takes his stand with those who favour the hypothesis of Aramaic originals, and in his renderings of the Gospel texts he is influenced by that hypothesis.

Another special feature of the book is the use it makes of Babylonian chronology. It is even claimed that as the Babylonian calendar was adapted to Jewish practice, it is possible for the chronologer to know, for example, on what day Jesus visited Jerusalem for each of the feasts, the Sunday of His last entry into the Holy City, the Thursday of the Last Supper (where so much else is recorded here, it is strange that the words of the institution are not), the Friday of the Crucifixion, the date of the first Easter.

Though the author is alive to critical problems he does not make a practice of discussing such in the course of his book. There he simply embodies his conclusions, which the reader is apparently expected to accept. But in the comprehensive and valuable Bibliographical Notes appended to the book we are taken a little further into the author's confidence. There, for example, we are definitely told—what we can only gather for ourselves as the book proceeds—that the basis of his Life of Jesus is the discovery that the narratives proper of the Fourth Gospel are fully trustworthy, while the interpolations agree in style and thought with the long sermons.

This accounts for a feature of the book that is apt at first sight to seem strange. It is the appearance it shows of being in its main substance nothing more nor less than a 'harmony' of the Four Gospels. But on closer inspection we see that the use of the Fourth Gospel has been subject to the aforesaid critical standpoint.

A remarkable instance of the author's trust in

the Fourth Gospel is his conclusion as to the age of Jesus at the time of His death. John's 'not yet fifty' (a vague reference) is set over against the 'Greek' Luke's 'about thirty,' and Jesus is said to have been born about 20 B.C. The 'Greek' Luke—so our author surmises—did not understand that no one could assume a prophet's authority unless he was at a minimum about fifty. Surely this whole matter wants reconsideration.

The author's faithfulness to John appears in his comment on the testing story of the raising of Lazarus: 'Such is the story originally told by John and with all the circumstantial detail of the convinced eyewitness. It is utterly alien in form to the literary miracle tale. As with so many accounts found in our best sources, the historian can only repeat it, without seeking for psychological or other explanations.'

Again, his faithfulness to John appears in his comment on the story of the empty tomb (the later stories of the Synoptists have, as he says, suffered literary 'improvement'): 'This is the story of the empty tomb—told by an undoubted eyewitness—full of life, and lacking any detail to which the sceptic might take justifiable objection.'

There are some questions as to propriety of expression I should be inclined to raise. Personally I could not bring myself to speak of Jesus as 'the most famous inhabitant' of Nazareth, much less as 'a confirmed bachelor'; nor could I accept the description of the style of the Authorized Version as 'an Aramaic-English jargon.' But I admire the learning which has gone to the making of these pages, and appreciate the thoroughness of the documentation; and if the author seems at times to be too sure of his judgments—well, he has earned the right to be fairly sure of them.

W. FULTON.

In 1938, when the Nazi attack on the German Confessional Church became serious, numbers of pastors and others took refuge in this country. British Jews were already giving extensive help, both to their own co-religionists and to persecuted Christians, but the main effort to organize relief for the new fugitives was the work of the Bishop of Chichester. In recognition of his services, a group of German theologians has issued a volume of essays under the title '*And Other Pastors of Thy Flock*,' edited by Franz Hildebrandt (Cambridge University Press; printed for subscribers). The eleven contributors cover a wide range; some deal with points of Biblical exegesis, some with matters of doctrine, and others with the relation between the Lutheran Church and this country. The most interesting for the general reader is probably Dr. C. G. Schweizer's condensed article on 'Co-operation of doctors and clergy.' The authors do their work with characteristic thoroughness and all are well worth reading. Yet the book itself is more important than anything it contains, for it attests the existence of a spirit—possibly even a party—in the German nation which offers some hope for happier relations in that new world to which we are all looking forward.

The Forgiveness of Sins, by Mr. Charles Williams (The Centenary Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a book which moves through deep waters and being written in a somewhat mystical strain does not make altogether easy reading. The writer begins with a suggestive chapter on 'Forgiveness in Shakespeare,' and then he goes on to his proper subject of the Biblical doctrines of sin and atonement. Great stress is laid on the Incarnation as the ultimate purpose of creation, and Christ by the shedding of His blood 'became Forgiveness in flesh.' Linked with this is the question of man's forgiveness of his brother man on which subject much is here said that is wise and Christian. In a concluding chapter on 'The Present Time' the problem of the forgiveness of our present enemies is discussed in a penetrating way. The book belongs to 'The Christian Challenge Series' and there is much in it to challenge thought.

The Rev. Stephen Neill, Bishop of Tinnevelly, delivered on two occasions at the Kodaikanal Missionary Conference a short series of lectures on the main articles of the Apostles' Creed. These lectures have now been published in two small volumes under the titles of *Beliefs* and *Foundation Beliefs* (Christian Literature Society for India; 1s. 9d. each). They form as fine a popular exposition of the Creed as can readily be found. They are fresh and up to date, yet loyal to the ancient faith, scholarly and lucid, abounding in apt illustration and thoroughly readable. They are obviously the product of a wise and experienced Christian mind, giving of its best for the instruction and inspiration of believing people.

A fair number of theological books has been published, and is still being published, in the Welsh language. It is comparatively seldom, however, that these works are translated into English, and the appearance of *The Revelation of God in the Old Testament*, by the late Rev. John Morgan Jones, M.A. (James Clarke; 6s. net), is the more welcome. It consists of a series of studies in the Old Testament, delivered in Welsh to a W.E.A. class, and published in the original language in 1935. John Morgan Jones himself was a representative of all that is best in Welsh religious life, and the translator's prefatory note reveals a personality even more striking than the book itself. The latter is a fine example of the sort of work produced by Welsh Bible students of the last generation. It is scholarly, and if on some points it is rather conservative, that may well be forgiven to a man who clearly understood and felt the Hebrew original and was not afraid to form and hold his own opinions. It is imaginative, with an atmosphere of almost mystical devotion which seldom appears outside Wales. Representative periods of Biblical thought are selected and discussed, the whole leading up to the supreme revelation in Christ. The translation is extremely well done; it is very rarely that the reader is conscious of another language underlying the English, and the book as a whole deserves to be widely read.

The Bedside Bible, by Mr. Arthur Stanley (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 8s. 6d. net), is a well-chosen selection of the most significant passages from the Old and the New Testaments and the Apocrypha. The text followed generally is that of the Authorized Version, but for the Psalms the Prayer Book Version has been preferred. The selected passages are arranged in chronological order so far as possible, and to each section a brief introduction is given so that the whole provides a fair outline of the Bible story. The book is of pleasing appearance, easy to handle and read, so that one feels it ought to be useful and popular.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation has begun to issue a series of Essays in Social and Economic Reconstruction of which we have received the first two. They cost only fourpence each and are well worth a large circulation. In the first Mr. Leslie Artingstall, B.A., writes on *Economics and the Christian*. After maintaining that economics which vitally affects human life and happiness cannot be as irrelevant to religion as mathematics he lays down (*a*) economic relations must have the emphasis placed on personality; (*b*) they must be capable of being universalized; (*c*) they must be in line with the methods adopted in all other relationships of life. Then he compares with these Christian principles some actual economic systems and finally discusses whether a long-term or a short-term policy is better in striving for reform, deciding for sound reasons in favour of the latter.

In the second the Rev. Glyn Lloyd Phelps, B.D., writes on *Christianity and the State*. The attitude of the Christian to the State and his conception of it are vastly important questions. The New Testament view of the State is examined. There is a tension between Ro 13^{1} and Ac 5^{29}, a tension which runs through the New Testament and through Church History. Where the tension has been slackened it has been disastrous for the Church and usually for the State as well. The State belongs to this world and in a fallen world is necessarily sub-Christian, yet it is ordained of God for certain purposes and in the New Testament is no ground for the '*anarchist*' ideas cherished by some Pacifists. The authority of the State is limited, not invalid.

The values, purpose, and method of Church and State will always remain different, and tension between them at any time may become acute. But the tension is not a paralysing thing, rather is it a case of action and reaction for the good, as often as ill.

Two volumes of sermons, one by a layman, the other (owing to the regrettable recent habit of stating simply the name of the author without any indication whether he is lay or clerical, Mr. or Dr.) by some one who may be either. In both cases the sermons are good. The layman is Mr. Bernard Lord Manning, M.A., senior tutor of Jesus College, Cambridge. He died in 1941 at the age of forty-nine, and his sermons were mainly delivered in the High Chapel, Ravenstonedale, Westmorland, where his father was twice minister. They are exceptionally able and suggestive. We are particularly grateful for the sermons on Old Testament themes, but the whole collection is a rare gift. The volume is entitled *A Layman in the Ministry* (Independent Press; 6s. net).

The other volume is called *Vignettes of Victory*, by Mr. A. Macfadyen (Williams & Norgate; cloth 5s., paper 3s. 6d. net). The 'victory' is that of faith, and this theme is pursued through the twenty-six sermons. The sermons are short but are excellent seed from which a good harvest may be reaped by preachers who know how to cultivate the ground.

God as Strategist, by Commissioner Samuel L. Brengle, D.D., and Others (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. net), is a short account of 'the hand of God in revival.' The eight chapters are written by officers of the Salvation Army. The book is not a reasoned argument but a series of historical studies and personal anecdotes of religious experiences which manifest the guidance of God in human affairs and the power of the consecrated life. It is written with all the fire and emotional intensity which we associate with 'the Army.'

The 'Albatross' Yacht Mission, edited by Mr. Andrew Stewart (Menzies; 6d. net), is fitly described in the sub-title as 'A Story of Joyous Christian Adventure.' In the early years of this century the name of the Mission was a household word in religious circles and especially among the fisher-folk in Scotland. Many still have grateful remembrance of the work done by the Mission, and its story as here told makes very pleasant and stimulating reading.

In times of trouble and bereavement, especially in the dread days of war, the thoughts of many hearts turn with keener interest to the Christian gospel of life and immortality. It is natural at such times that books of Christian comfort should appear in greater numbers. *Rendezvous*, by the Rev. W. H. Elliott (John Murray; 2s. 6d. net), belongs to this class. It is written with beauty and deep religious feeling, but its writer, in his earnest desire to minister consolation, goes much beyond the grave reticence of Scripture. 'We know not what we shall be,' says the Apostle, and it is best to recognize frankly that the conditions of life in the world beyond are a sealed book to us. Beautiful imaginings, however comforting, are not an authentic part of our faith. All the same there is much in this little book that is true as well as beautiful.

Blue Peter! by Mr. J. Roland Evans (Oliphants; 2s. 6d. net), is fitly described as 'a romance of the early years of William Carey.' There is a deal of romance in it but it gives a sufficiently faithful picture of Carey's early days. It is eminently readable and should interest boys in the famous missionary and his great adventure.

An able and balanced book on the Jewish

problem comes from one who is herself, probably, of Jewish blood but is by faith a Christian—*The Jews in a Christian Social Order*, by Olga Levertoff (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). The reasons for anti-Semitism are fairly estimated, and it is clearly and convincingly shown that Christianity, by its belief in Christ, can have no kind of toleration of racialism. The Jewish problem is part of a bigger problem, namely, the relevance of Christianity to the historical process. Christianity is a Jewish Messianic religion, and (says the writer) the primary and ultimate Jewish problem for the Christian is how to convince the Jew of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. For the Jew, among other questions, one of the most fundamental is: Are we a racial group or a religious group? These and other aspects of this urgent problem are discussed with breadth of sympathy and with a remarkable intellectual insight, and the book may be strongly commended to all who are interested in the Jew, racially or religiously.

A book that contains both a personal witness and also the fruit of discussion with all and sundry is called rather mystifyingly *Change Here for Britain* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). The sub-title is 'The Revolution that is Happening,' and the author is the Rev. Cecil Northcott, M.A. Mr. Northcott has gone about Britain extensively since the war began, with eyes and ears open. He has had discussions, questionings, wrangles, debates, and conversations in trains, homes, queues, in villages and towns. The book is therefore an essay in social observation, and the chapters are arranged round the topics the author has heard discussed. He calls it 'a symposium of opinion,' and he has secured the services of several friends as critics. The last part of the book is called 'Commentary and Discussion,' in which the criticisms of the friends raise questions which are posed for the reader, or groups of readers. The topics are: The Family, Education, Work and Leisure, the Church, and Democracy. The chapter on the Church is fair and sympathetic. But, indeed, the whole book is suggestive and provocative, and would form a valuable vehicle for discussion among groups of thinking youth.

The Broadcast Talks on *How Christians Worship* have been published by the Student Christian Movement Press at 2s. 6d. net. The speakers included such well-known people as the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Lichfield (Dr. Iremonger), Dr. E. R. Micklem, and the Rev. Neville Davidson. There are three very interesting historical talks, and the rest consist of expositions of the worship in various churches. Broadcasting tends to make speakers simple, and it also tends to concentration. And these speakers have both these good qualities. This is a quite delightful book, easy to read and full of information.

The Art of the Missionary, by the Rev. Ronald O. Hall (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is designed as a series of talks to missionaries and those who may be looking forward to such work. These talks contain the considered judgments and ripe wisdom of one who has given his life to China. They set a high and, even at times, a terrifying standard before the aspiring missionary, and occasionally they indulge in a play of paradox which may be perplexing. But they contain many reflections and counsels which will enlighten and benefit others besides missionaries.

The Student Christian Movement has published a little book on the Hebrew prophets by J. B. Thomson Davies, M.A., under the title *Heralds of God* (5s. net), for use in schools. She covers the ground from Moses to John the Baptist, giving to each prophet a short chapter, with an occasional 'interlude' to explain the background for the next subject. She writes, as always, simply and clearly, and makes good use of the archæological material available. Her general point of view is quite modern, though occasionally she has not appreciated fully the advance that has been made in Biblical studies, and in a few instances the children may have something to unlearn later. This, however, is not a serious matter in such a book, and does not detract from its real value. Four useful and simple maps are given on the inside cover, and there is a practical chapter on making a time-ladder with the various periods in Israelite history indicated by different colours. On the whole this may prove to be the book for which many school teachers have been waiting.

Burma to-day is much in the eye of the world. It will therefore be of special interest to read *Burma, Christian Progress to the Invasion*, by Mr. Alexander McLeish (World Dominion Press; 9d.), which is No. 4 of the 'War-Time Survey Series.' The work of Protestant Missions, especially Baptist, for over a century has resulted in a Christian community of more than half a million, while the Roman Catholics claim over a hundred thousand. This infant Church, like the Church in China, will be tested in the fire, and needs the prayers and sympathetic interest of the Christian Church that it may endure and come forth as gold.

Europe in Transition, by Mr. Alexander McLeish (World Dominion Press; 9d. net), is the fifth of the 'War-Time Survey Series.' Its purpose is to show from the Christian point of view how the present situation has arisen and how the churches in Europe stand numerically and spiritually. Accordingly the first part of the pamphlet is historical and then follows a review, critical and constructive, of the crisis with which the churches are now faced and of the obligations thus thrust upon them. The survey is done with care and the whole makes a piece of vigorous writing.

The Theology of the Epistle to Diognetus.

By the Reverend Professor H. G. Meecham, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester.

The *Epistle to Diognetus* stands high among early Christian writings. There is an air of mystery about this little document. Not only is it of unknown authorship and provenance, uncertain in date and composite in character, but strangely enough it is mentioned by no ancient writer. Moreover, its sole textual source is a single mediæval manuscript, which has itself perished. But the interest and charm of the Epistle are undeniable. Its rare elevation of thought is clothed in language at once simple and stately and warmed by 'intensity of conviction.' Many older scholars disregarded the Epistle as a mere addendum to the works of Justin Martyr. But nearly all who have given it attention accord it high praise. Neander ranks the Epistle 'among the finest remains of Christian antiquity.' Bunsen says that it 'is indisputably, after Scripture, the finest monument we know of sound Christian feeling, noble courage, and manly eloquence,' whilst Lightfoot characterizes it as 'the noblest of early Christian writings.'

Often classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers the Epistle belongs rather to those of the Apologists. Or perhaps we may say that it forms a literary nexus between the practical exhortations of the Fathers and the more formal apologies of Justin and his successors. But the relation of the Epistle to the apologetic class may be more closely defined. In general tendency it anticipates the Eastern rather than the Western type of Christian thought.[1] That aspect of thought, primarily Christological, which was to appear clearly in Athanasius is here foreshadowed. Further, *Diognetus* ranks itself with those didactic and apologetic tracts which sought specially to commend Christianity to educated readers of the time.[2]

A twofold aim underlies the apologetic literature: first, to stress the truth and excellence of Christian teaching and to relate it to the philosophic thought of the age; secondly, to justify the place and function of the faith in society and thus secure toleration from Gentile governments. There is also a marked anti-Jewish strain in the apologies. But this was more or less secondary to the two main purposes named. The author of the Epistle is not indifferent to the second aim, but it is not his primary concern. Whilst his polemic against pagan idolatry and Jewish superstition is vigorous, it is ancillary to his main object, namely, to show the reasonableness of the Christian faith and its appeal as a way of life. Moreover, our author is to be classed with Tatian and Theophilus in making a strong contrast between Christianity and antecedent faiths, heathen and Jewish alike.

Some apologists, for example Athenagoras, recognize that there had been a progressive revelation of God in human history; hence Christianity was the fulfilment of good already present in the pre-Christian world, a view very marked in Clement of Alexandria. It is not so in this Epistle. Here the Christian religion is conceived as a wholly new moral power rescuing men darkened in mind and doomed under sin. Again, the author puts the apologetic emphasis in the surest place. He has nothing to say of miracles and the argument from prophecy. For him the Christian life itself is the unanswerable proof. Other apologists make much of this; for him it seems almost the whole of his positive case. Theologically, the most striking differentia of the Epistle from the apologists generally is the insistence upon Christ as Redeemer.

The body of the Epistle enlarges upon three questions put by a certain Diognetus.[3] First, it discourses on the variety and nature of heathen gods and the folly of worshipping them. Then follows a severe condemnation of Jewish sacrifices, rites, and customs. This leads to a delightful picture of early Christian life and a quasi-theological interpretation of the Son of God as Revealer of the true knowledge of the Father and Agent of man's salvation. After the manner of an epilogue the closing chapter commends the character and fruits of the faith as an *imitatio Dei*. Chapters xi–xii form an appendix by a later hand.

The epistolary form is merely a literary device. The author, whether answering a genuine inquirer or penning an open letter to an imaginary one, is alive to literary effect and states his case with obvious care. He gives what is really a brief apologetic treatise in epistolary dress.[4] Ewald[5] thinks that the Epistle is a studied answer to a *book* written by Diognetus about his failure to understand Christianity. But this is mere surmise. The language and style must be characterized in a sentence or two. The Greek is good Hellenistic with a marked approach to classical standards in vocabulary and diction. Most effective is the use of epigram, contrast, and assonance. The style has elegance and charm, and is enlivened by an occasional rhetorical excess, not to mention some happy touches of satire and a refreshing candour.[6]

[1] See Scullard, *Early Christian Ethics in the West*, 8 ff.

[2] *Diognetus* and the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix are the two best examples of this type. Each, addressed to a private person, has in view a wider constituency.

[3] κράτιστε Διόγνητε. Cf. Lk 1[3].

[4] Cf. in this regard Theophilus' *Ad Autolycum* and Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*.

[5] *Hist. of Israel*, viii. 175.

[6] For example, speaking of 'those specious philosophers' who say that God is fire, he adds parenthetic-

As so often in early literature the authorship is veiled; it is likely to remain so. External evidence is entirely lacking, and the Epistle itself is curiously impersonal. Language and style alike, apart from other features, are decisive against the view that it came from the hand of Justin Martyr. One critic was put to such straits in this matter that he was disposed to make its first editor (H. Shephanus, 1592) its author!

The question of the date of the Epistle is similarly indeterminate, the internal evidence being far from conclusive. The very universality of thought and tone makes it hard to fix the period of the Epistle. The prevailing view is that it derives from the middle or latter half of the second century. Lightfoot suggests *c.* A.D. 150, and there are not a few general considerations that support this relatively early date.

The chief value of the Epistle lies in the stress it places on the practical aspect of Christianity as a way of life. In glowing terms the author sets forth the Christian ethos. A new spirit of moral earnestness has come into the world. It is exercised within the earthly order, but its source and strength are from above. Christianity is a moral power that renews the individual within and lifts him above the world. The note is one of joyous, almost rapturous, faith. Dialectic is not to our author's taste. In this he contrasts with the studied arguments of other apologists. Theologically the main chapters are vii.–ix., and these are integral to the whole apologetic appeal of the Epistle. The theology indicates a simple form of belief. There is no elaboration, for example, in the author's doctrine of the Logos, nor does he seem aware of the religious and philosophic difficulties involved in the idea of the incarnation of the Son of God.[1] Moreover, there are noticeable omissions. No mention is made of the Old Testament. This is the more strange in that some Christian apologists made great play with Old Testament prophecies as predictions of the coming of Christ.[2] The silence of the Epistle in this regard is due not to Gnostic contempt for the Old Testament so much as to the author's polemic against Jewish tenets and customs as a foil to the Christian religion. More striking is the fact that there is only a general reference to the historic life of the Son, and none to His miracles, suffering, death, and resurrection. The author comes nearest to this in the passage, 'Himself gave His own Son as ransom for us,' etc. (ix. 2). No sacraments or Church order are envisaged.

Too much must not be made of these omissions, since the discussion is limited by the supposed queries of Diognetus. But if the Epistle derives from a relatively early date the simplicity of the theological contents is noteworthy. Here at least there is no emergence of doctrinal or credal forms.[3] In temper the author of *Diognetus* is to be classed among the sub-apostolic writers of whom Sanday says:[4] 'there is no conscious speculation or systematizing; yet thought is at work; language and usage are in process of becoming more fixed; the foundations of more developed doctrine are really being laid, but laid, as it were, underground.' The *Preaching of Peter*, with which *Diognetus* shows kinship, also belongs to this transitional type.

It must not be inferred, however, that the Epistle has little theological value. The core of its teaching lies in its conception of God and the redemption He effects in the Son, and these we may now briefly consider.

1. God.

Prior to the coming of the Son man was ignorant of God. It is in the conception of God that both pagan idolatry and Jewish superstition stand condemned. The worship of stocks and stones is foolish, since it is offered to senseless images. The Jews, it is true, recognize the One God and Master of the universe. But they too are foolish and even impious; for by their sacrifices they suppose that God is in need of such offerings, and by their ridiculous ritual observances they misconceive His character and wisdom. The theories of 'the plausible philosophers' who identified God with fire or water or some other created element are obviously absurd, since any one identification has equal claim with the rest. All such strivings after God are discredited. Man's knowledge of God came from God Himself. It was revealed in the Son to faith, 'by whom alone it is given to see God' (viii. 6).

The God thus self-revealed is primarily 'the One God of the universe' and 'Master'; 'the all-sovereign, all-creating, and invisible God'; 'Master and Maker of the universe, who created all things and disposed them in their *due* order.' The Logos is the agent of creation, but God its primal source. The Providence of God ordains the seasons, and bestows on all men what they lack, while He Himself is beyond all need. As to His character God 'is not only a lover of men but also long-suffering.' And this He is unchangingly, 'kind and good and free from anger and true, and He alone is good.' The author insists that 'force (βία) is no attribute of God.'[5] The power (δύναμις) that He wields is moral.

ally, 'they call that God whereunto they themselves are destined to go' (viii. 2).

[1] Celsus (*True Word*, iv. 2; cf. ii. 31), writing *c.* A.D. 170, argues that incarnation involves limitation and change, and that such is unthinkable in an immutable God.

[2] Gwatkin (*Early Church History*, i. 194 f.) remarks that the 'everlasting voice of Prophecy' is found in all the apologists except Arnobius. *Diognetus*, if classed among the apologies, should also be excepted.

[3] It is to be noted, however, that the *Apology of Aristides* (*c.* A.D. 138) affords some evidence of an already formulated Christian creed. See J. Rendel Harris in *Texts and Studies*, I. i. 13 ff., 24 f.

[4] *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, 12.

[5] Perhaps we may detect here the Platonic conviction (see the *Sophist* and the *Timæus*) that the divine element in the world is an agency of persuasion, not of compulsion. But, like other apologists, *Diognetus* gives point to the conviction by showing how the principle of persuasion is exemplified in the incarnate life of the Logos.

But for our author the dominant conception is the 'goodness' and 'love' of God. These qualities are reflected in all the divine dealings with men. It was love of mankind that moved God to make the world, to subject all earthly things to men, to endow men with reason and mind, to grant them the power to aspire to Himself whose image they bear, and to promise the Kingdom in heaven to those who loved Him. The gifts of God attest His love and care, and it is not possible to discriminate among these gifts; all are necessary and useful to men.

It is, however, in the fact of redemption that the author sees most clearly the manifestation of the goodness of God. He would fully endorse Tertullian's dictum [1] that 'nothing is so worthy of God as the salvation of men.' In chapters vii.–ix. of the Epistle we have a clearer exposition of the meaning of the Atonement from one point of view than any before Irenaeus, who was the first of the Fathers to give a careful analysis of the work of redemption. We shall indeed look in vain for any developed theory of the Atonement in Christian writings of this early period. The time for a formal statement of the doctrine was not yet come. But certain features of our author's view may be plainly discerned and are of interest as indicating in a personal utterance of faith one trend of Christian thought.[2]

1. The need for redemption lay in man's sin, which entailed the inevitable reward of spiritual incapacity and death. Nothing is said of the view held generally by the apologists (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho,* xxx.) that redemption is from the power of the demons. Belief in demons, *i.e.*, intermediate spirits who operate in human life as agents of the supreme Deity, was widely prevalent in pagan thought. Most of the apologists shared this belief and addressed themselves to the task of proving the reality and extent of the malign influence of the demons. The author of *Diognetus* gives no hint that he held this view, though we may not, *e silentio,* conclude the contrary.

2. Redemption springs from God Himself, but is effected in the Son. He indeed shares the counsel of the Father and is the appointed Agent of salvation. But the initiative lies with God, who 'first loved' men (x. 3) and who in the beginning purposed to save: 'having conceived a great and unutterable design He communicated it to His Son alone' (viii. 9). It was God Himself who 'established among men and fixed firmly in their hearts the Truth and the holy and incomprehensible Word' (vii. 2). The primacy of God comes out clearly throughout the Epistle. The rôle of the Father in the redemptive plan is differentiated from that of the Son as Sender is from Sent. The Son was 'sent' in gentleness and meekness to save and persuade and to call men in love, not to compel nor to judge (vii. 4). But in this commission of the Son it was God Himself moving towards men in redeeming love: 'He did not hate nor repel us nor remember our misdeeds, but was long-suffering, bore with us, Himself in mercy took on Him our sins, Himself gave His own Son as ransom for us' (ix. 2). That some phrases point also to the Son's activity in redemption only illustrates the author's view of the perfect accord of will between Father and Son.

3. Redemption is rooted in God's love and goodness. The execution of the plan determined in the heavenly counsels from the beginning was deferred until the appointed time. God waits till man, self-convicted by his own deeds, has learned his moral impotence. And this, not because God is neglectful of man or takes pleasure in sins, but out of His forbearance. Then He sends forth the Saviour. Here is the answer to Diognetus' third question, namely, why Christianity had not appeared at an earlier time. God wanted to show that man could not save himself. The picture is not that of an offended or implacable Deity, but of a patient God who yearns to save. 'The entire conception and process of Redemption is, from first to last, a revelation of unimaginable love; a love which can only elicit, from men who have eyes to see it, the profoundest emotions of amazement and of adoration; and this love is, at least, not less emphatically the love of the Father, than the love of the Son who died' (Moberly).[3] Hence the author shares the Pauline wonder at the saving purpose of God as being wholly contrary to all human expectation.

4. The immediate result of redemption is that man is enabled to 'enter the Kingdom of God,' its moral issue is holy and joyous living. Redemption and sanctification are linked together. After describing the salvation through the Son and the faith and knowledge by which it is apprehended, the author continues, 'with what joy, think you, will you be filled? . . . loving Him you will imitate His goodness' (x. 3–4). Thus the redeemed man brings forth ethical fruits. Henceforth God is in him as 'mind, light, honour, glory, strength, life.' The evidence of this divine presence (*παρουσία*) is seen also in the endurance and triumph of the Christian martyrs.

It is clear that in the main *Diognetus* conceives the Atonement from the point of view of 'moral influence.' Redemption is achieved by the love of God awakening its response of love in man. 'How greatly will you love Him who so first loved you?' (x. 3).[4] But that is not all. There is a strain in the Epistle which suggests that atonement is more than the expression of God's love. God gave His own Son 'as ransom for us' (*λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,* ix. 2). The statement is summary. No reference is made to Satan from whose dominion man is to be 'ransomed,' an idea expressed by Irenaeus and Origen. Nor is it clear how far we should read in the term *λύτρον* the transactional ideas which

[1] *Adv. Marc.*, ii. 27.

[2] 'By far the most complete statement at this period of the work of Christ is contained in that very attractive little work, the *Epistle to Diognetus*—a work which may be dated about the year A.D. 160' [the Bishop of Gloucester in *The Church Quarterly Review*, cxxxi. (1940), 5.].

[3] *Atonement and Personality*, 331.

[4] A Johannine thought (1 Jn 4^{19}) reflected in Ignatius.

were associated with it. Further, the words, 'for what else could cover our sins but His righteousness?' (ix. 3) seem to border on a theory of satisfaction, and possibly there is a hint of the substitution of the Son for sinners in the exclamation, 'O the sweet exchange' (ἀνταλλαγή).[1] J. Scott Lidgett,[2] referring to crucial parts of *Diognetus*, vii., ix., says: 'these passages will show that this Epistle might stand with equal propriety at the head of the so-called moral doctrines of the Atonement, and of those which look upon it as a satisfaction for sin.' It is quite clear that, while the moral theory of the Atonement predominates in our author's thought, it is not exclusive of other elements which later developed into the vicarious penal and substitutionary theories.

In this regard it is important to observe that it is in virtue of His righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) that the Son redeems. In an eloquent passage the Epistle names the moral qualities of the Saviour: He is holy, innocent, just, incorruptible, immortal. It then seems to sum them up in one word, righteousness. The Pauline term is used, but with a less forensic sense. The death of Christ is obviously in mind, though not expressly named. But the necessity of the death is not considered, nor does the author show how it actually effects redemption, apart from the response of love evoked from men. His language (cf. especially ix. 5) trembles on the verge of the substitutionary principle. But the decisive step is not taken. Rashdall[3] certainly minimizes that passage too much as 'after all only a rhetorical paraphrase of the ransom passage in the Gospel, read in the light of Is 53 and of St. Paul.' It is sufficient for our author to declare that the source of redemption is in God and that it is as the Righteous One that the Son saves, without particularizing the method by which the Atonement is made. The broad lines of the author's view are clear, but it is neither developed nor complete. He is, however, thoroughly evangelical in conviction: none can enter the Kingdom of God except through the Son, who is able to save even creatures devoid of moral power (ix. 2–6). Lightfoot[4] says of the central part of the Epistle (v.–vii.) that 'it seems to embody the very spirit of the Gospel.' It is to be noted that small place is given to man's part in the Atonement. Man must 'believe in God's goodness,' a faith which he must first 'desire.' But redemption is solely the work of divine grace. In this again the author is thoroughly Pauline.

2. The Son.

Specific titles are 'His Child' (παῖς), 'the Son (υἱός) of God,' 'His only-begotten Son,' 'the Saviour,' 'the Lord.' The title 'Word' (λόγος) occurs only in the appendix, with the doubtful exception of vii. 2. The preference for the term 'Son' anticipates the Christological interpretation in terms of divine Sonship which is apparent in Athanasius.

The Christology is simple and is plainly of the 'pneumatic' type; the Son is a divine Being who has appeared in human form. No precise definition of the relation of the Son to the Father is attempted. But it is clear by the use of the various titles, and by the whole conception of the 'Child' sharing in God's heavenly counsel, and being 'sent' to men, given as 'ransom,' and shown as Saviour, that the author thinks of the Son not only as a premundane personality, but as one subordinate to the Father. The relative frequency of the term 'Son' bears this out.[5] But the very passage which describes the sending of the Son (vii. 2) carefully stresses His majestic nature and office. The 'Sent' was no minister to men, or angel, or ruler, or one of those who direct earthly things, or of those entrusted with the dispensations in heaven. He was 'the very Artificer and Maker of the universe Himself' (substantially the same title is applied to God, viii. 7), whom the author exalts in a lengthy description of His universal dominion over nature. The view is that of the apologists generally, that in essence the Son is one with the Father, whilst distinct in person and subordinate in function. He is God so truly that His coming can be described as the coming of God, His Atonement as God's taking upon Him our sins. His revelation as God's revelation of Himself (Radford).[6] All this suggests a dignity inherent in the Son comparable with that of the Father Himself.

The function of the pre-incarnate Son is conceived particularly in relation to the world. He was its creative Principle, Agent rather than Author of creation. But the writer's interest is more religious than philosophic. He looks upon the Son as essentially Revealer and Redeemer. *Diognetus*, like Justin Martyr, recognizes a didactic purpose in the Incarnation. But the revelation is not so much of the mind of the Father as of His will to save, which purpose He effects in the Son. Hence Christ's further function is redemptive. He exercises the mediatorial offices of Ransom for sin and the Justifier of mankind. Justin excepted, the apologists generally tend to stress the work of Christ in creation rather than in redemption. But not so with our author. The soteriological aspect is set in the forefront. The Son not only reveals the true knowledge of the Father, but also fulfils the plan of salvation in His mission of love to men.[7]

[1] The phrase, however, is ambiguous. The 'exchange' may be that of man's wickedness for righteousness.

[2] *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, 424.

[3] *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 206, n. 1.

[4] *Historical Essays*, 7.

[5] 'There is an intractable element of subordination in the functions which he (St. Paul) assigns to the Son (cf. 1 Co $15^{27f.}$)' (Vincent Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, 129). Cf. also 1 Co 11^{3}. The idea is very marked in Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, i. 12, 13; ii. 13).

[6] *The Epistle to Diognetus*, 39.

[7] It was reserved for Athanasius to develop this *religious* meaning of the Incarnation. But it is noticeable how *Diognetus* makes the Incarnation of the Word pivotal. It is in the coming of Christ, not in any moral precepts or doctrines of the faith as such, that the author finds the source of the new life of Christians in

The Appendix (xi.–xii.) adds something further. It was the Word who was sent to appear to the world, and who, 'speaking plainly,' revealed to disciples the secrets of God contained in Scripture; he was indeed dishonoured by the chosen people, but preached by the apostles and believed by the heathen. The Word is eternal. He is from the beginning, yet is ever young in that he is born in the hearts of the saints. As Son he enriches the Church by revealing and increasing grace among the saints. That is, the once incarnate Word can still speak to those whom he will, he is ever the teacher of the saints (xii. 9). Thus the historic incarnation and the abiding spiritual presence of the Word are linked together. We note here the lack of any reference to the person and work of the Holy Spirit, as also in chs. i.–x. The Spirit if in view at all is regarded as an agency of the Word.[1] Other apologists also are so concerned with the doctrine of the Logos or Son that they either fail to dwell on the Holy Spirit, or sometimes ascribe to the Son functions usually falling to the Spirit. Justin speaks now of the Son and now of the Spirit as the inspiration of men of old, though elsewhere he distinguishes clearly between the two Persons (*Apol.* i. 6; 13). Similarly in *Diognetus* it is the Word by whom the Church is enriched, and the Word who speaks through those whom he chooses. Radford finds in this doctrine of the Logos as being 'still the dominant truth of Christian theology' an indication of a second-century period.

The aid lent to the development of Christian theology by the apologists of the second century calls for recognition. Their endowments were in the main slender. But their work was lasting, if judged less by any immediate effects than by its preparatory and pioneer quality. In the writings of these men we find the beginnings of Patristic philosophy. But theirs was the philosophy of a Revelation. Whilst availing themselves of the best elements in pagan thought their thinking was basically Christian. The Christian μυστήριον had been disclosed to faith; it was their task to interpret it in the light of reason and approve it by reference to a commonly accepted standard of culture.[2]

Here in an incipient form is that accommodation between Christianity and the highest philosophic thought which was to be made more complete by the great Alexandrian teachers of the third century. The apologists may claim at least the honour of the pathfinder. In this dignity the little *Epistle to Diognetus* has its share. But its real merit lies elsewhere. The author never moves very far from the practical aspects of the faith. His mind is of the pragmatic order. He points to the purity of the lives of the Christians, their constancy under persecution, and their works of benevolence as unmistakable evidence of the truth of their religion. It must of course be admitted that there is little that is new or creative in the Epistle. But that is only to say that it is typical of second-century Christian writings as a whole. Moral and spiritual emancipation is the characteristic feature of Apostolic Christianity. But of necessity there followed a period when that freedom was to be interpreted and secured. If the first task is to create, the second is to conserve. *Diognetus* strikes the latter note: 'the faith of the Gospels is established, and the tradition of apostles is guarded.' Who shall deny the defender of the faith his due meed of praise?

the world. Similarly this new quality of life, seen in the heroic endurance of persecution and in its power to propagate itself, is the best attestation of the Incarnation.

[1] Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma*, ii. 209) thinks with regard to the apologists that 'their conception of the Logos continually compelled them to identify the Logos and the Spirit.'

[2] We find a precedent in the apologetic aim of the Alexandrian Jews of 2–1 B.C., who, having gained through constant contact with Hellenism a more hospitable outlook than their Palestinian brethren, endeavoured to make Greek philosophy subserve the interests of Israel's faith.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Magical Beam.

By the Reverend Lionel R. Floyd, B.A., B.D., Carshalton Beeches, Surrey.

'I am come a light into the world.'—Jn 12^{46}.

Do you know what it is that helps our pilots home to their base on a dark night or in stormy weather? The other day I found out and I want to tell you about it. I am not giving away any secrets, for a description has already appeared in one of our national newspapers!

It is an invisible beam something like wireless rays. It runs across the aerodrome and stretches out long distances on either side. As the pilot returns home, he can pick up the signals as far as a hundred miles from his aerodrome. He first switches on his selector apparatus to the number of his station, just as you switch on your wireless to 'North Regional.' Then, with the help of his earphones, he listens for the signals.

The astonishing thing is that he can tell what direction he is taking in relation to the aerodrome. As he draws nearer, the signals become louder and clearer. At greater heights, too, the signals are stronger.

Now for the magic! Not magic really, but the extraordinary way science helps the pilot. If he flies to the left of the beam, he hears dots. If he flies to the right, he hears dashes. If he flies along the beam, which means that he is making straight for the aerodrome, he hears a constant high-pitched sound.

There are other sounds, too. As the aircraft approaches the aerodrome, it passes over small wireless beacons, called the outer and inner markers, each of which gives out its own peculiar signal. These signals tell the pilot he can begin to lose height and prepare to land. By the time he has passed the inner markers, he should in normal weather be able to see the aerodrome, and make a safe landing.

In addition to sound signals, there is also something like a clock face in front of him, to enable him to check by sight what he has heard in the earphones. Down the middle is a glide-path indicator. As the pilot approaches the aerodrome the needle rises. Underneath is a pointer which 'kicks' sharply to the left if the pilot turns left of the beam, and to the right if the pilot turns right. But as long as he flies along the beam, the pointer remains steady in the centre. At either side of the glide-path indicator is a light which flashes as the aircraft passes over the outer and inner markers.

Nothing is left to chance. The pilot hears signals and sees a shining light which tell him exactly where he is in relation to his home base on the darkest night or in the foulest weather. And by the help of the invisible beam many a tired pilot has succeeded in making a blind landing in conditions when not even the aerodrome was visible.

The young disciple, too, has an invisible beam to help him. Yet although we cannot 'see' Jesus in the flesh, we can 'tune in' to Him, and both 'hear' and 'see.' 'He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.' Are you going to listen for the word of Christ so that you may have a reliable signal in dark and stormy weather?

Christ, however, is also a light for the young disciple, a light you can trust, a light that never fails, a light that will always see you home. 'I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness.'

As You Please.

By the Reverend Harold Derbyshire, Harrogate.

'We . . . ought . . . not to please ourselves.'—Ro 15^{1}.

One day recently my little daughter was talking to a lady at a neighbouring house who was busy tidying up her garden. 'Do you like gardening?' she asked. 'No,' replied the lady, 'but I have to do it.' '*I* have to do a lot of things I don't like,' said the little girl; 'but when I grow up I shan't do them!'

We often feel like that when we are very young, don't we? I heard of a boy who asked his father, 'Daddy, how old have you to be before you can please yourself?' But the answer was, 'Nobody has ever lived as long as that!'

It seems a grand idea to be able to do exactly as we like, but it isn't as simple as all that. What if everybody pleased himself? Suppose, for instance, that all the motorists drove along the middle of the road, or on the side they happened to fancy on a particular day! And, if we all said, 'I'll look after myself, and never mind anybody else.' What about the time when you were ill, or in trouble, and nobody bothered to look after you?

Now St. Paul says 'we ought not to please ourselves.' If we are strong, we should bear the burdens of those who are weak. There is an old saying, 'the weak go to the wall,' but that is not the Christian way. You will have heard of Dr. Albert Schweitzer. While he was still in his twenties, he had become a distinguished scholar, a Professor at Strasbourg University, and one of the most celebrated organists in Europe. He loved music and the life of learning, but, when he was twenty-one, he had made up his mind that he would enjoy these things for a few years only. It was not fair, he thought, that he should have all the advantages of a civilized land, while in some countries there were people who had no teachers to tell them the good news of Jesus Christ, and no physicians to care for their bodies. So, at the age of thirty, Albert Schweitzer was trained as a doctor of medicine, so that he might go and minister to folk in the heart of tropical Africa. He has been there ever since, not pleasing himself, but giving up the whole of his time to work for the natives who never before had had a doctor to help them in their troubles and illness.

You will be happy if you always remember that if you want your life for your own—to please yourself—you will lose the best that is in that life; but that if you will give your life to Jesus Christ, you will find a new life, fuller and finer than all your dreams.

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

The Raised Values.

'Together with Christ he raised and seated us within the heavenly sphere in Christ Jesus, to display throughout ages to come his surpassing wealth of grace and goodness toward us in Christ Jesus.'—Eph $2^{6.\ 7}$ (Moffatt).

The Christian faith had not yet been formalized when these things were written. A new world of life has been opened, and through personal relationship with Christ, and what He stood for, the people of the new faith are consciously in possession of a wide and wealthy franchise. Whatever else grace and salvation in Christ may carry, they have to do in the Apostle's mind here chiefly with the powers of personality vitalized and intensified under the impact and dynamic of a new quality of living.

It was the claim and promise of Jesus that He

was come that men might have life and have it to the full.

Here in the opening of this document, earlier than the Gospels, is the testimony of a glowing experience to the justness of His claim. It is crowded with phrases which describe life in finer quality and larger amplitude.

Suppose, then, such terms as ring out in the prayer, which at no little distance precedes the text of this sermon, translated into a living experience. It would mean a human personality incomparably increased in its values and powers. 'The eyes of your understanding enlightened'—which means insight so lit up that we see vividly; and real faith, as Ruskin said, is 'veracity of insight.' 'Knowing the hope to which he calls us'—that is, aware of life as a vocation to be pursued in the light of a promise. 'Knowing the riches of the glory of your inheritance in the saints'—that is, to be conscious that every high value which the best of our race has ever put into life is ours for a possession and a resource. 'Knowing the exceeding greatness of his power'—that is, to be conscious of dynamic resources fed into life as from an unfailing fountain.

It was a tremendous testimony made by these New Testament people. They said that it was simply true that because of what Christ had become to them, and had wrought in them, the world and life were more significant, wealthy and exciting. It was not just their talk. We have the testimony of history that it was this new impulse and heightening of personality in the followers of the new faith which first arrested the attention of a tired age and a sick world. These Christians said it is this which in Christ we are certain is true: the King of all the universe is Friend and Father, and their joy in it runs like a thrill through the New Testament.

The affirmation to be explored is that the Christian view of God, man, and the universe, confirmed by the living Christian experience, has broadened, deepened and intensified life whenever and by whomsoever it has been or is wholeheartedly proceeded upon. This is not to say that there have not been interpretations of the Christian scheme of things in the terms of dogma which have definitely narrowed and shadowed life. Some of these have been accepted and dominant over periods of Christian history. But they have been perversions and distortions. With every revival and spring-tide of vital Christian faith and experience, with every recovered contact with the springs of life in Jesus Christ, there has come every time the same exultant sense of a mighty quickening of the powers of personality and the enrichment of the values of life.

It is a claim made for the Christian view of things on the ground of *its range*.

'What think ye of God?' is the question against which every religion, and every variety of every religion, must stand and be judged. According to its answer it is placed high or low in the scale of religious and spiritual values.

In its answer to this question the Christian faith stands solitary and supreme. The Christian view of God is in itself a direct and operative enlargement of personality and life. It has three great affirmations. God is Light. God is Love. God is a Spirit. There is not a word in these beyond a child's uttering. There is not an affirmation here which is not a deep where all our thoughts are drowned. There is a range and spaciousness here unrivalled, and no man can truly say, 'I believe in God through Jesus Christ,' without affirming a conviction which, in the measure of the thoroughness and intensity of its acceptance, enlarges his whole view of the universe and life. 'My father,' said Carlyle, 'was religious with the consent of his whole faculties.' The Christian view of God is one which a man can hold with the consent of his whole faculties, fearing not to give every one of them free range, and finding, in the doing of it, his faculties not only satisfied, but taken possession of, extended and refined.

It is so also with the Christian view of man. Alike by the account it gives of his origin and kinship, the measure it takes of his fall, the estimate it holds of his potentialities, the assurance it offers of his destiny, it is a flat denial to every belittling view of the human personality, and a stern rebuke of any and every mishandling of it.

It is so also with its view of the universe. 'We now know too much of matter to be materialists,' said the Earl of Balfour when Gifford Lecturer. The Christian view of the universe has always known too much to abide in that particular prison-house.

It is a claim made for the Christian view of things on the ground of *its realism*. To begin with it goes straight, and with the plainest speech, to a reality which man avoids naming when he can. It insists that it is reality; the one sinister, savage reality with which every man has to deal. It speaks of sin. It faces up to it. It does something far greater than drag it into the light. It brings it within the shadow of the Cross of Christ.

> The solemn shadow of Thy Cross
> Is better than the sun.

The goodness of faith in Christ is that any self-condemned and any self-distrusting soul, any man who has seen enough of the world temptations to startle him, any man who, confronting the world of perverse and evil possibility in himself, has been beaten down, may bring his weakness and guilt and fears together with such poor treasure of good purpose and desire as may be his to bring, and by the simplest of trusts in a God who keeps His word, secure the great engagement of God for redemption, and for all that finally matters in life.

It is a claim made for the Christian view of things on the ground of *its radiance*.

Accepted and proceeded upon, the Christian view of things brings the glint of romance with it. It tells of conversion which is the unceasing romance of religion—the light and life of God creating and kindling newness of life in us. It speaks of love, the spark which lights a thousand lamps in life. It speaks of service, and tightens every power of life under a sense of responsibility.

To name the last as a contribution to the zest and colour of life is in contradiction to the mind of many, who live as if they believed that the romance and gaiety of life lie with irresponsibility and a devil-may-care flippancy. You have only to study the faces and watch, when they are off their guard, the demeanour of those who so think and live to know the falseness of their idea and hope. Of all modes of life the deliberately irresponsible is the most draining and disillusioning.

The stuff of great high romance is made out of the heroisms man can show when fighting a hard battle. It is of such things in human nature that the masters of romance in literature have shaped their stories, and none may belittle the things that the humanist has to tell of the resources which the soul of man can furnish and display. But to this fine thing, the faith of a Christian adds a finer and, it may be added, a more reliable thing, the courage of faith, the serenity of an abiding peace. The Christ, who out of the heart of His conviction about God, said, in the hour when the awful realism of the Cross smote upon Him, 'I have overcome,' lights up life with that same sense of victory, and throws a colour about its drabness, a light finer and rarer than was ever on the lands and seas of high romance. Do not conceive the Christian way as lying in the regions of a cold propriety, a mere decorum. Rightly conceived and daringly followed, it is the abiding romanticism. There is no career greater than to follow Christ. A wide franchise is His gift, and His calling is to a spiritual adventure.

There is but one thing which causes the lips that utter this affirmation to stumble and halt. It is that we, who call ourselves Christians, do so poorly proclaim this about our Lord. Our mediocre and stagnant spirituality, our wan and anæmic testimony, stand in such contrast to the life abundant.

The last word must be to ourselves, who do our Lord this injustice. We have but touched the fringes of what Christ means, and of what He can do for and in us. Somehow we must get deeper into Him. We must give Him a freer course to do more justice to Himself in us.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Mystery of the Unknown Intruder.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY, LEICESTERSHIRE.

'Lest coming suddenly . . . '—Mk 13^{36}.

At last I discovered the reason for my uneasiness in that hotel bedroom. It was the other door. I had entered the room by one door and I had only to open it again to find myself once more in the world of tried and familiar things. But I have never felt wholly at ease in a strange room with two doors, and it was that other door which troubled me. Where did it lead to? What could there be beyond it? I sat down to try to write a letter, but my eyes would stray involuntarily towards the other door. Suddenly I became aware that the knob of that other door was beginning silently and slowly to turn. . . . And from that day to this I never discovered who the unknown intruder may have been or what lay behind that other door.

Life itself is like that room with two doors. There is always the 'other door' leading out into the unknown, the untried, the unforeseen. We sometimes lump together all these intrusions from the unknown and call them 'accidents.' And the queer thing about such occurrences is not that they happen but how they happen. Indeed, this has been for many the major personal problem of life, and it may help if I simply state my own experience and share the convictions at which I arrived.

In the mercy of God I had been spared, until a certain date, most of the deeper sorrows and troubles of life. And then suddenly one day the first blow fell. I say 'first' advisedly, for I remember thinking at the time, 'I wonder what next?' It was, indeed, the first of a series, and experiences similar to mine have many a time shaken and shattered the faith of infinitely better and braver men than I. My problem was this. I noticed that these occurrences had little or nothing to do with one another. They were not linked together in any sequence of cause and effect. The only connexion between them was that they happened to the same person and within a certain period of time, as though, somewhere in the Unknown, behind that 'other door' whence they had emerged, there were a set and sinister design. Then, one day, when my problem weighed heavily upon my mind, I happened to come across Jung's book, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, and as I turned the pages I suddenly came upon a statement of my own case. Jung gives many startling instances of this strange behaviour of 'chance occurrences' and tells how they seem to arrange themselves in groups or series. He calls to mind an old professor of medicine who used to say to his students, of a particularly rare clinical case: 'Gentlemen, this is an absolutely unique case, therefore to-morrow we shall have another one like it.' He goes on to note that this strange behaviour of the accidental was familiar to our far-off ancestors. When primitive man of a thousand years ago, or the savage of to-day, meets with an unpleasant experience in the morning he will take care to watch his steps and he will certainly not attempt anything important during the rest of that day. He has had an Omen. An Intruder has appeared from the Unknown, and you may be sure that there are others following in his train. 'Misfortunes never come singly.' Or if he meets with an accident on arrival at his new camping-ground, he will take care to pack up his belongings as soon as he can. He has had the Omen. 'It never rains but it pours.' Jung does not claim to offer a solution, he merely states the case.

While yet reeling under these blows and trying to find the meaning of it all, I wondered whether our Lord's experience, in this particular also, may not have been akin to our own. It is not always safe to lean too heavily upon the argument from

[1] T. Yates, in *British Preachers*, iii. 69.

silence, but I think we can venture to infer that, up to a certain date, our Lord's life had been a happy and uneventful one. There are one or two hints of trouble, if not of tragedy, but a man of thirty is very fortunate who has known no sorrow. And then, suddenly, one day, it came. He had gone into some synagogue, 'and they watched him —that they might accuse him.' And then the storm broke loose. For two or three years thereafter there came blow after blow, stroke after stroke, sorrow after sorrow, until at last the agonizing cry was wrung out of His heart: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And I have often asked myself, in all reverence, whether He, too, wondered what was going to happen next, and what was behind it all.

Can we find, in something that He once said or did, a clue to the unravelling of this mystery of the Unknown Intruder? I had no sooner asked myself this question than there flashed across my mind a picture so vivid that I might have been there myself to witness the scene. One day, when He and His friends were out walking together, He Himself went on a little way ahead while the rest of them lagged behind. At last they turned the corner and what they saw rooted them to the spot. There was Jesus, as they came upon Him suddenly, listening to Someone whom they could not see, and talking to Someone who was not there! The 'other door' was wide open. He had got through to the Unknown. He was in touch with the One behind it all. They looked on spell-bound, and it was not until 'He had ceased' that they dared to approach. He read the question in their eyes. He made them sit down, and began: 'Suppose one of you has a friend, and you go to him. . . .'

1. *The Unknown is Friendly.*—'Suppose one of you has a friend. . . .' Yes, that is it. What a man needs, in his loneliness, is a Friend. And when these intrusions emerge, as they do sometimes, one by one, out of the Unknown, it is not blind fate that sends them, or any avenging deity, but a Friend. Yet it is not right to say that He 'sends' them—He brings them. He comes Himself in person. 'Pardon my intrusion,' He seems to say, 'but I come as a friend.' And if He comes suddenly, in the guise of an intrusion, He will not allow that intrusion to be of such a kind as to wreck the faith of any man. On the contrary, being a friend, He always sees to it that, wrapped up in that very intrusion, there is a personal gift which could not possibly have come to us in any other way. He shares with us His own discovery. 'Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.' Behind the Unknown there is a Friend.

And if He is a friend, I must learn to treat Him in all His comings as a friend. Indeed, it is through trust that the Unknown becomes known as a friend. 'Suppose one of you has a friend, and you go to him,' I must not wait in doubt or dread, 'lest coming suddenly. . . .' I must invite Him, expect Him, meet Him, welcome Him. For behind the Unknown I have a Friend.

2. *The Unknown is Fatherly.*—And when, that day, those men came upon Him suddenly, holding communion with the Unknown, one of them, speaking for all, said to Him: 'Show us how we, too, can find touch with the Unknown,' He said to them: 'When you pray, say, Our Father.' What men need, in their oneness, is a Father.

The Unknown has always filled men with dread, not only because of its intrusions upon human life, but because of the manner of their coming. Why do misfortunes never come singly? Why does it so often happen that, if one comes, another must be at its heels? That, surely, must be part of the larger mystery of the oneness of life itself. Our deeds and their consequences are woven into the nexus of events and we are in very truth members one of another. We do more than live in this world, we live in it together. And behind it all is no unheeding fate but a loving Father. What all men need, in their togetherness, is a Father.

Until we grasp this truth this world in which men live together will never be a world of peace, or righteousness, or joy. We begin with events and try to manipulate them to suit ourselves, and it all works out wrongly. We begin with men and with nations and do our adding or subtracting, but the parts refuse to fit into any coherent whole. We must begin, not with men, but with God, for 'he hath made of one blood all nations of men' to live together, and in His will is our peace. The Kingdom will never come, or the power, or the glory, until we begin with God, and learn to say together, Our Father.

3. *The Unknown is Forgiving.*—Men have gathered, from the nature of its intrusions, and from the manner of their coming, that the Unknown has no purpose, or if there be any purpose, that it is merely punitive or coldly cruel. The purpose was disclosed once and for all in the Great Intrusion of the Cross:

> Out of the mists a Hand is stretched for me,
> A Hand for my sake wounded, and I turn
> From mystery and questioning and doubt
> To kneel before the Cross.

What a man needs in his loneliness is a Friend. What men need in their togetherness is a Father. But what man needs in his sinfulness is a Saviour. The Unknown becomes known as He forgives. And that is how He is gradually and grandly working out His great design. It is not the punishing of the wicked. It is not even the rewarding of the good. It is, as St. Paul would say, the goodness of God leading the world to repentance.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Generosity of God's Providence.

BY THE REVEREND A. B. LAVELLE, M.A., B.D., PH.D., DARLASTON, STAFFS.

'But he said unto her, Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What? shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?'—Job 2^{10}.

One of the symptoms of the spiritual desolation of this tragic age in which we live has been the almost total eclipse of the Christian doctrine of Divine Providence. If words are windows to the

soul, then, the loss of this word 'Providence' from our private and common speech tells its own tale of bewilderment and frustration. For it is hard to resist the conclusion that we so seldom use the word because 'the world view' behind the word is no longer in that sharp and clear spiritual focus it was for our fathers and forefathers. In his novel, *The Silver Spoon*, the late John Galsworthy says of one of his characters 'in his view God was not so much interested in the fate of individual aliens as the Governor of the Bank of England in the fate of a pound of sugar bought with the fraction of a Bradbury.' This 'pound of sugar' feeling is not uncommon in our day and recalls the realism of Job's wife and her grim counsel 'Curse God and die.' Can any one doubt that to invoke even the omnibus word 'Providence' is for many to-day to seek an opiate for tranquillity of mind and rest of heart that has no real basis in the nature of things? Beyond the busy contemporary scene there is for them, alas, no Personal God but only

the dreaming, dark, dumb Thing
That turns the handle of this idle show.

1. For most people to think at all of Providence is to think in terms of the *problems* of Providence. This is not so dismaying as it may sound. For 'the problem of evil'—and in these days of war the problem is on our doorstep—is the most urgent of tasks if we are in any way to justify the ways of God with man. That is why to discuss theodicy and Providence is virtually to discuss the same thing. Moreover, the problem of life for every one of us is the daily overcoming of evil and it is idle to suppose that an everyday necessity should not at times dominate the mind even 'in a cool hour.' But a deeper answer still is that there would be no 'problem of evil' unless we already knew the goodness of God. 'Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?'

The whole Christian idea of Providence rests ultimately not on thin speculations on any 'impersonal but gracious deiformity of existence,' but on our Lord's revelation of the Absoluteness of the Father's Love for man. We are often sorely tempted to think that while this may well have been true in the world of the Gospels, it can no longer be true for us in this machine-ridden generation, that whatever 'Providence' there may be in life it is careless of the individual. Is it altogether surprising that many should think like this? To serve a machine for many hours a week is the everyday experience of thousands, and the line of least resistance is to think of oneself as a machine tool! The aged miner when he finally 'hands in his check' often has felt like the unwanted spoil of his own pit mound. And in more varied and more subtle ways the same thought has occurred to almost all of us in this scientific and industrial age.

Yet do we not forget too readily that our Lord's teaching on Providence was given at a time when human life was almost the cheapest commodity on the market place? You can put your ear to the ground almost anywhere in the Gospels and you will hear as in our own day the distant tramp of soldiers marching as to war. Occasionally you may even hear the rumble of falling masonry killing workmen as in the tragic accident at the Tower in Siloam. Never once will you be entirely out of earshot of that unceasing litany of woe that rises from the lips of life's unfortunates. Surely Lecky was right when he reminded us that the secret of the Christian gospel was not only that the whole universe was transfigured by love, but that 'it taught the weary, the sorrowing, and the lonely to look up to heaven and to say, "Thou God carest for me."'

And where else can we reach this comforting assurance unless by an unconditional surrender of ourselves to the whole truth of Christ? If it is true that the abuse of the word 'Providence' by a Napoleon or a Hitler has been almost as flagrant and sub-Christian as the misuse of the word by the unthinking pious, is it not because both have overlooked the implications of the stupendous fact of our reconciliation with God through the death of His Son? Measured by this revelation of the generosity of God's love, man's place in the universe, as Charles Wesley sang, is pre-eminent.

Less favoured were the angel powers,
Their crowns are cheaper far than ours,
Nor ever cost the Lamb His blood.

2. Some time ago a modern historian was moved to register this dismal verdict on our own day. 'It required hard thinking,' he said, 'and subtle understanding to trace the tides that moved vast masses of men, even when standing in safety high and dry upon the shores of history. But buffeted in the maelstrom of one's own time no sign of a plan emerged to guide the intelligence.' May it not be that his verdict should be regarded as of equal value to that of the astronomer who once said that he had swept the heavens with his glass and found no God? The utmost we can say is that the providential reading of the script of our own lives makes it appear obvious that this is the most natural reading of the past and that the coming of our Lord in 'the fulness of time' is its supreme vindication.

When we try to express in the chill of language the purpose of the Divine mind in the creation both of the world and of ourselves, can we do better than say with the Schoolmen that it is nothing less than to communicate His own Perfection to all creatures, and that the attainment of holiness is our supreme personal vocation? Must we not at all costs recover for ourselves this forgotten truth that generosity is an attribute peculiar to God? Here is the root of the Christian doctrine of Providence; here, too, is what gives meaning to worship. Are we not at times so submerged in the material forces around us that not only what is spiritual and unseen seems both shadowy and unreal, but that with our humanistic outlook we have pictured ourselves as adding to the external Glory of God? Surely this truth of the generosity of God is the personal discovery life is ever prompting us to make. The shaking events of these last three years have awakened

many from their 'dogmatic slumber' to say with St. Paul 'experience worketh hope' and so to read even in the blood-stained face of this modern world a gospel of hope. As Christians we are verily without excuse if we cannot even now in this dark hour renew our faith in that 'prospective contrivance' of God we call His Providence and in the firm assurance that under Him even the fierceness of man shall turn to His praise.

3. It is in the Divine life of our experience of God that we learn most of this generosity of God's Providence. 'That which knits and unites God and the soul together,' said John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, 'can best teach it how to ascend and descend upon those golden links that unite, as it were, the world to God.' Is there any other way of echoing and answering Job's question —'shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?'

God cannot will evil and His permission of it is conditioned by His purpose that man, through free co-operation with God's grace, should strive against evil and by the attainment of holiness figure forth God's highest attribute. Or to put the same truth in the unforgettable phrase of Keats this life is 'a vale of soul making' and not a 'vale of tears.'

The generosity of God's Providence outspans the short reaches of our few decades. Were it otherwise we should have to place a question mark and not an *Amen* after the greater number of our hymns and prayers! 'But thy loving-kindness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever' are words that bid us not forget that the ultimate justification of the generosity of God's Providence is not in this world. We do well at times to pray God to vouchsafe to give us 'those things which for our unworthiness we dare not, and for our blindness we cannot, ask.'

The final outcome of life is with God, and His Kingdom is in time, but not of time. Even now we can share the triumph of our Saviour's trust and devotion, knowing that all things are under the Omnipotence of God's love and through the very evil of the Cross we can receive His unspeakably good Gift.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Three Leashes which Jesus put on Fear.

'Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.'—Mt $10^{26. 28. 31}$.

The instinct of fear has a necessary and useful function, which it would be fatal to discard. Otherwise no precautions would be taken for individual and public safety and we might soon be dead. But fear must be held in and kept in its place, if it is not to degenerate into a morbid panic which runs away from truth and duty. We must get the upper hand and put a leash upon it, if it is not to make us bolt when we should resist. How are we to restrain fear? The frightening impression may be curbed and altered by a sense of humour, which puts a leash on nervous dread by making the dreaded object look absurd. We have defied intimidating circumstances if we can make a joke of them and laugh back in the face of their threats. It has been said, 'Physiologically, this laughter is probably just a checked and transformed gasp of terror.' Yes, it may be that physiologically, but what is it psychologically and morally? A brave sense of humour is an insight, a poise, a sanity which is inspired by some great confidence. We cannot afford to laugh at danger unless we believe in spiritual ultimates. Some valid confidence must take a firm hold of our tremors. Accordingly, the leashes put on fear must be sound enough to stand the strain and not snap with the furious pull of events. Jesus defines the dependable restraints for fear, the lasting checks on the runaway mood! What are these leashes which our Lord enjoined as able to hold fast against the deadly drag of alarm? They are three.

1. The Assurance that the Truth will win is a Durable Leash on Fear.

Thomas Hardy has a character who is lamenting the death of a neighbour in the village and says with a wistful sigh: 'Poor soul: all her shining keys will be took from her, and her cupboards opened, and little things a' didn't wish seen anybody will see: and her wishes and ways will be as nothing.' It may be a pathetic exposure, or it may be an inspiring disclosure, and old letters may be found hidden away which tell a bonnie story of sacrifices made and costly loyalties honoured. People are often afraid that their dutiful actions will never accomplish anything worth while. 'Fear not,' says our Lord, for the secret good will make itself known as an incentive, it will come out at length, and perpetuate itself as a memory, an example, an inspiration to others. This assurance is a durable leash for fear, and overcomes the pull towards discouragement and desertion.

It is not only death that brings many secrets to light and corrects many wrong impressions. Life also is revealing, and the course of events is not opaque, for the truth shines through, and strikes the mind. We are inclined to be pessimistic about the future of the German nation, which has been nurtured for a generation on evil myths and fallacies. How can such a people ever be so disillusioned and changed as to live with other nations as a good neighbour? Sometimes the prospect looks bleak enough, and we wonder if the truth will win against such infatuated and systematic error. But it is a baseless dread, for the truth has a genius for publicity and comes out in unexpected ways. The new vision may sometimes come quite suddenly. It came thus in the laboratory of a Bavarian university to Professor Röntgen, who was experimenting with vacuum tubes, when one day he passed an electrical discharge through a hidden tube and observed to his surprise that the fluorescent screen lying on the table became luminous. Strange! Why this luminosity, when

ultra-violet light was excluded by the black shield round his tube? Röntgen investigated what had taken him unawares, and discovered X-rays. But these X-rays had been shooting forth from vacuum tubes for twenty years before any one was aware of their presence. Now the truth forced itself upon the mind as a piercing power, for these X-rays were found capable of penetrating a dense substance, to take radiographs of human vertebrae beneath the flesh and reveal what was wrong inside the physical organism, that it might be put right. The hidden reality presented itself to a man absorbed in another quest, and as the result of his experience, because there is an unveiling principle embedded in things. There is an unmasking law in the universe, and if scientific truth thus showed itself to a German why should not *spiritual* truth show itself to a German? The leash that Jesus puts on fear, to keep it from bolting into faithless gloom, is the assurance that the Christian message is too luminous and piercing to escape notice.

2. The Assurance that Character is more sacred than Life is a Durable Leash on Fear.

The lives that have been laid down rather than submit to the barbarity of oppression, pillage, and sadism are not merely thrown away in a devil's dance of death. Can we speak of that sacrifice as anything less than human life springing up to its perfect humanity and fulfilling its most sacred and Divine potentiality? Waste? No! It is worship of the highest human values, and if these values had not been honoured men would have lost their humanity. Yes, and some of our heroes had not a fair deal from their native land, but came from slums, and perhaps they never had a steady job, and could not find a decent opening into life. Yet despite this shabby treatment, they have rallied to the defence of the nation with cheerful magnanimity. In *The Antiquary* there is a passage which tells of a threatened invasion, and Edie Ochiltree, the old soldier, who was now a bluegown, licensed to beg alms from the countryside, was preparing to do his part. Monkbarns, the laird, teased him with the remark: 'I would not have thought you, Edie, had much to fight for.' To which Edie Ochiltree replied, '*Me* no muckle to fight for, sir?—isna there the country to fight for, and the burnsides that I gang daundering beside, and the hearths o' the guidwives that gie me my bit bread, and the bits o' weans that come toddling to play wi' me when I come about a landward town?' Edie Ochiltree, the *beggar*, said that.

Our Lord put a tight grip on our trembling fits, which might stampede us into shame and destruction, by affirming that moral values are supremacies which alone make life worth living. The curb for the flinching spirit is His call to preserve and exalt the higher self, lest it be submerged in material interests and physical wants, and men lose the saving vision of the unseen and eternal. Those who have chosen to suffer rather than submit to evil have risen to what is most human and therefore most Divine in them, like the dear lads who went to death with a smile because they knew their sacrifice was a bigger achievement than many a long life. Ben Jonson was right:

> It is not growing like a tree
> In bulk, doth make Man better be:
> Or standing long an oak, three hundred year,
> To fall a log at last, dry, bald, and sere:
> A lily of a day
> Is fairer far in May,
> Although it fall and die that night—
> It was the plant and flower of Light.
> In small proportions we just beauties see;
> And in short measures life may perfect be.

3. The Assurance of a Fatherly Providence is a Durable Leash on Fear.

Our Lord puts a lasting check on our anxious shrinking from the exactions of life by stating the Divine care for the birds which were counted to be of little worth. The controlling power under which we live is not merely a Divine government department but a generous and attentive personal interest in every one, so that no one is lost sight of in the crowd, no one is too insignificant to be considered in the state requirements of God's Kingdom.

It is a lasting check on fear to be certain of a Fatherly Providence and to discover how appropriate and timely it can be. Mrs. Browning wrote: 'Most people, when they thank God, do it with a sigh, and the sigh is far more heartfelt than the thanks, as if they had just grace enough to admit that it might have been worse, but never grace enough to confess that it has been mercifully well.' We must have grace enough to discern and confess that it has been mercifully well, if we are to hold in our fears and keep them from dragging us down. But trust in Providence is not an insurance policy against risk and loss. Jesus does not promise that the individual who has committed himself to God will be treated as a cosmic pet and bear a charmed life. God's care for the individual is God's purpose to secure the rights of the individual, and to make a society where the good of persons will outweigh any planned order or any vested interest. To save human personality from being disinherited by such mass movements of evil as the Herrenvolk cult of Germany and the State Shinto of Japan, some individuals may succumb. But we confess it is mercifully well we have an exhilarating thankfulness, because we know we are greatly loved by God, and to enjoy a great love, to feel its power, its wisdom, its loyalty, its tenderness is enough to make any one dauntless.

Such are the three leashes which Jesus puts on fear. But He cannot put them on our nervous dread and hold it in, unless we accept Him as our Redeemer and Master and let Him take command. He is the highest authority, the only absolute expert on courage, for no man or no crisis could frighten Him away from His task. He offers to share His secret with us, to make us partakers of His indomitable spirit. Make sure that, whatever else is lost, you do not lose His offer of a stout heart.[1]

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Crisis on the Frontier*, 168.

The Hidden Years.

By the Reverend B. G. Collins, A.T.S., Lincoln.

In the course of His ministry our Lord visited Nazareth where He had been brought up, and where some members of His family still lived. The rumour of His rapid fame had preceded Him, and on the Sabbath His old friends and neighbours crowded to the synagogue to see and hear Him. But their astonishment is itself astonishing. 'Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man?' is Mark's report of their marvelling;[1] and Luke agrees, 'And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth: and they said, Is not this Joseph's son?'[2] And yet He had dwelt among them for over thirty years! Why were those who had known Him from boyhood so amazed? How could they have been so blind to His greatness who was to prove the most creative and significant figure in human history? Familiarity scarcely accounts for such dulness of perception. John Buchan indeed supposes that before the Ministry our Lord 'had won something of a name for His skill in expounding the Jewish scriptures in the local synagogue,'[3] and Sholem Asch boldly places part of the scene in Nazareth early in the unrecorded years when 'the people opened mouth and ear, for they had never heard the like from a youth.'[4] There is no warrant for such suggestions except the problem they attempt to solve.

But is it not possible that the difficulty is at least partly due to our misapprehension of the kind of greatness which was our Lord's, and that nothing is told of the Hidden Years because there was nothing remarkable to tell? It is not every type of greatness that compels the premature notice of men. Creative imagination finds adequate expression only in its own proper work, and outside this may be unsuspected. When Dostoievski's *Letters* were published they disappointed many because they dealt so little with the subjects so powerfully exhibited in his novels. And if we had Shakespeare's correspondence it is unlikely it would prove any more interesting. And in his case especially, if reverence will permit, we have a most suggestive parallel to the mystery of Nazareth.

The unapproachable greatness of the world's supreme poet needs no comment save Lamb's 'If Shakespeare was to come into the room, we should all rise up to meet him.'[5] Like the Bible his works invite fresh commentators in every generation and remain inexhaustible. But though he was not an ancient but a modern, living in the brightest period of our history, it is not possible to write his biography. All the known facts of his life can be told in a few words, and none of them throws any light on his genius and achievement. It is so incredible that many have been unable to believe that an obscure Stratford man and actor could be the author of the immortal Plays, and have attributed them to Bacon or Oxford, or to others who made some stir in that great age. But what gives plausibility to the more reasonable of these speculations is the assumption that the mind which wrought these supreme works of human genius must have made its mark upon men in other ways.

But this is to misunderstand the nature of Shakespeare's genius. The author of the Plays could not have been a man of aggressive type, thrusting himself on the attention of others. All Shakespearean students are agreed on this. 'Readers of Shakespeare, I believe,' says Bradley, 'imagine him to have been not only sweet-tempered but modest and unassuming. I do not doubt that they are right; and, vague as the Folio portrait and the Stratford bust are, it would be difficult to believe that their subject was an irritable, boastful, or pushing person.'[6] And Raleigh says of him, 'Children, we feel sure, did not stop their talk when he came near them, but continued, in the happy assurance that it was only Master Shakespeare.'[7] Keats, who was 'of Shakespeare's tribe,' distinguishes between the poetical character he aspired to and the 'egotistical Sublime' as illustrated by Wordsworth. 'It has no self,' he says; 'A poet is the most unpoetical of anything in existence, because he has no Identity—he is continually in for and filling some other body.'[8] It is this that supplies the key to the stupendous genius of Shakespeare. As Hazlitt explains, 'The striking peculiarity of Shakespeare's mind was its generic quality, its power of communication with all other minds, so that it contained a universe of thought and feeling within itself, and had no one peculiar bias

[1] Mk 6^2.
[2] Lk 4^{22}.
[3] *Augustus*, 327.
[4] *The Nazarene*, 275.
[5] Hazlitt, *Winterslow*.
[6] *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, 319.
[7] *Shakespeare* (E.M.L.), 14
[8] *Letters*, ed. Forman, i. 173.

or exclusive excellence more than another. He was just like any other man, but that he was like all other men. He was the least of an egotist that it was possible to be. He was nothing in himself; but he was all that others were, or that they could become.'[1] It was this meekness and lowliness of heart which was the very condition of the incomparable realization of the interior lives of men that distinguishes Shakespeare from all others. Egotism would have made such understanding impossible, and have blurred the magic mirror of his mind. 'He was not impressive,' says Mackail, 'for it was not his aim to impress people. He was always doing quite the reverse, taking their impression.'[2] No doubt, like all men, he knew disappointment and sorrow, as he knew the power of temptation and the corruption of his 'sinful earth.'[3] But it was no personal experience but the world's vast trouble that found voice in the great Tragedies that shake the souls of men. The life of such a one as Shakespeare was in the imagination that envisioned all humanity. There need have been little to record of external crises and events, as there appeared to be nothing in him to kindle astonishment in his fellows.

The analogy suggested between the obscurity of Shakespeare and the Hidden Years of our Lord is more than superficial. While, of course, there can be no real parallel (one thinks again of Lamb: 'If that Person was to come into the room, we should all fall down and try to kiss the hem of His garment') it is not irreverent to point out that He also had, and in a greater measure even than Shakespeare, the supreme power of imaginative realization. He once invited the weary and heavy laden to come to Him because He was 'meek and lowly in heart.' He was without the egotism that bars the way to an understanding of others, and could enter through His divine humility into every condition. It was the secret of His limitless compassion and His power over men's hearts. It is as unnecessary to enlarge upon the universal interest displayed in His parables as it is to insist upon their imagination and perfect artistry. It is neither irrelevant nor irreverent to recognize the superlative poetic quality of His mind, of His vision of life and the world. It is not an accident that Christians as diverse as Erskine of Linlathen and Robertson of Brighton should have been almost as familiar with Shakespeare as with the Gospels. Up to a certain point, it is the same quality of imagination that is found in both. We can think then of our Lord living unobtrusively in Nazareth. His Personality for all its strength was not of the thrusting and aggressive type. Luke speaks of the 'grace' that characterized His youth, the attractiveness that remained one of His essential qualities. Perhaps Ben Jonson's 'gentle Shakespeare' has much the same idea in it. 'Little children, we may be sure,' says Glover, 'came to Him of their own accord, and were at ease with Him.'[4] It goes without saying that there was nothing censorious in His relations with His fellows, nor could He have been associated in their minds with any exceptional austerity of life. He moved among them kindly, unassertive, His mind the *Speculum Mundi*, with no extraordinary marks to compel notice. In the oft-quoted words of Turgenev, so strangely like Hazlitt's, 'He had a face like everyone's, a face like all men's faces.'[5] But His eye missed nothing of the moving life around Him, of its rich comedy and dark tragedy, and in His imagination all was re-created and had an intenser being. He built up

> greatest things
> From least suggestions; ever on the watch,
> Willing to work and to be wrought upon.[6]

Of such a life there could be nothing to tell, and apart from its outcome in art or action nothing to cause excited comment. And it was not in Nazareth that His work was accomplished.

Our reluctance to associate even so great a name as Shakespeare with our Lord is due partly to the fact that we know Him only *after* His mysterious baptism 'with water and the Spirit' when, to use words that grope for the truth, even His personality was supernaturally enhanced and charged with such awful power that, not with the magical utterance of the greatest of poets but, in a dreadful and redeeming Action He turned to a new direction the helm of the world. And it is partly due to a fearful sense of the measureless difference between the mind of Shakespeare though it reflected the universe of men and things, and the Mind that apprehended all this and, in addition, the spiritual universe, alive with the infinite reality and life of God. There were frontiers of mystery before which even Shakespeare's imagination failed, but the divine imagination of our Lord passed unfalteringly into the secret places of the Most High as none had ever done before Him, or after save through Him. It is here that we can speak if with least adequacy yet with greatest assurance. The same 'meekness and lowliness of heart' that opened a door for Him into every life, when turned to God gave Him a Vision such as no prophet had even dreamed of. And in the light of that vision He walked in

[1] *The English Poets.*
[2] *The Approach to Shakespeare*, 20.
[3] Sonnets, 146.
[4] *Conflict of Religions*, 121.
[5] Marchant's *Anthology of Jesus*, 380.
[6] Wordsworth's *Prelude*, bk. xiv.

peace and blessedness until the hour came when it flamed into the Divine Demand to which His obedient soul could give but one reply.

His home in Nazareth where He grew from childhood to manhood, little as we know of it, deserves attention. He was one of a large family, and it was there, as we should expect, that traces are left of His unfamiliar ways. His words about His Father's House[1] seem to have startled His parents as though they suddenly lighted up other words that had fallen from His boyish lips. Luke's comment: 'His mother kept all these sayings (everything) in her heart' opens up a wide prospect of small but significant happenings in the home. It suggests too that it was in her that He found a confidante, and so much understanding as was vouchsafed to Him. All children ask questions that perplex and sometimes agitate their elders. What questions were asked by Him? The home was clearly a devout home after the best Jewish pattern. The rigour of James 'the Lord's brother' probably represents its standard and atmosphere. That 'none of His brothers believed in Him' need not imply any lack of affection or esteem, but only that He did not correspond to their idea of what a religious teacher should be. He was not a 'Bible student' after the manner of the Rabbis, poring over the Rolls and patiently resolving 'difficulties'; and great as was His reverence for the Scriptures He treated them with sovereign and disconcerting freedom. If there was no cleavage in the family it was because He entered into no rivalry with the teachers of the synagogue, though the house in Nazareth must often have echoed with disturbed question and quiet and perhaps bewildering answer. Dare we suppose that there was a time when He became aware of the difference between His own apprehension of God and the religion of His home and synagogue, and that this gave Him a choice of ways? All men are tempted on their own level, and His temptations must have been connected with His vision of God and His fidelity to it. But it is clear He had no trace of the common infirmity of religious persons, the itch to interfere with other people's ways. 'No man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is good'[2] is one of His wise and tolerant sayings.

Though He must have taken His turn at reading the Lesson in the Sabbath services, there is no reason for believing that He had ever preached or spoken in the synagogue. He was never a Rabbi or 'Teacher of Israel' in the official sense, or aspired to be. Even in His ministry it was not primarily as a Teacher that He gathered His disciples round Him. In Nazareth His interests were elsewhere. He was not a 'man of books' in any scholastic way. His inspirations were from the order and beauty of the world, the multitudinous life of men, and the purity with which His own heart reflected the Love of God in which He beheld them all. His fellow-townsmen watched Him curiously as they saw Him bending over flowers, or making His way up the hills of Nazareth for the sake of the wide prospects of earth and sky. The mountains witnessed more than the fervour of His midnight prayer. They saw a rapt exultation in the rhythm and glory of the stars. Men may have smiled without understanding at His almost religious love of children; they did not smile at His unconcealed interest in alien folk. Galilee was the arena of hot-blooded patriotic movements, but there were many who were 'quiet in the land,' and like Mary in the *Magnificat* cherished the hope of a divine intervention. It is evident that our Lord could remain aloof from Zealotism without remark. Galilee was also the country of many Gentiles, and from the Nazareth hills could be seen the traffic of the nations. But He did not share the repugnance of the Jews to them, and when at last He did speak in the synagogue it was to emphasize God's grace to the heathen. This sympathetic attitude could not have originated in the ministry. He must always have included them in His visions of the advent of the Kingdom of Mercy. There is no indication of any clash with the synagogue authorities on this or other matters; but neither this nor His concern and friendliness for the frail and neglected would commend Him to the leaders of religious opinion of the stricter sort, such as was one who was even then at school in Tarsus far away. But it was in His own heart that there shone the light in which all that was of God was revealed in the world or in the life of men or in the Holy Scriptures. These He read as no contemporary read them and they yielded treasure hidden from His generation. It was in this way that He 'discovered' the Songs of the Servant in 2 Isaiah. His Mission would not have been different had He never seen them, for He was greater than all Scriptures; but they were as a mirror in which, when the time came, He saw His own face.

It is in some such way we can, in gleams and fragments, see something of the spiritual life of Christ during the 'Hidden Years.' The great universal features of the Ministry were present from the beginning, but nothing but perplexity can come of contemplating those that belong to the Ministry alone and antedating them. In Nazareth, even in the realm of religion, there was nothing that men knew or could observe that demanded their attention. His secret was His own and could not be imparted to others in any forms of speech. It was because, without offending

[1] Lk 2^{49}. [2] Lk 5^{39}.

against ordinary Jewish piety, His communion with God was unlike any other that the townsmen of Nazareth did not even recognize in Him a character wholly devout. Most of us see only what we are taught to see, and the spiritual life must needs have its conventional marks to be discerned as true. In view of the sequel it is unlikely that the Nazarenes dreamed of having even a 'saint' in their midst.

Behind the mystery of the Nazarene there is the fathomless mystery of the Incarnation, but in His humanity were fused æsthetic and ethical values, natural and spiritual activities, that are almost always in conflict in others. There was a harmony and balance of powers and insights in Him that appear to us as contradictions, but were altogether invisible to those around Him in the unrecorded years. One only who was near Him 'kept all these things in her heart,' and she worshipped in a bewildered silence.

Entre Nous.

Moving House but not Home.

Speaking at St. Martin-in-the-Fields lately, Canon Guy Rogers spoke of some experiences of his own the week before in Birmingham when moving house, and then gave the three reflections that had come to him—destruction, selection, and adaptability. 'What a lot of junk accumulates as years go by; things we have outgrown and things we have had thrust upon us against our will. In moving house we learn to appreciate the value of a Corporation bin. Shabby thoughts and crusty tempers might also be deposited for destruction.

'I am against leaving behind the things that touch our emotional life; those things are precious. Some things may not have much material value, but they have a spiritual one. What is home without those symbols of reality, of memory and of love? God has a niche in Heaven for treasures of that sort.

'Moving house gives us a chance to select—a chance to make home more of a harmony by way of selection. Sometimes there is a clash in colour between the bedspread and the eiderdown just as there is between a man's conduct at home and at business. In moving into a new house there must be adaptability. It is a trying time even for the family cat.

'Our cat is a very intelligent one. It knocked at the door of the old house; but getting no answer, it is now settling down comfortably in the new house, and occupying the best chair. After this war is over we shall move into new conditions and we shall need to learn the principles of adaptability. Here "we nightly pitch our moving tents a day's march nearer home." We have moved house, but we have not moved home. Life is full of changes, but as the days pass we get nearer to the Father's Home which never changes. There is no moving home for one who belongs to God.'

Proverbs xv. 1.

'"I remember one night," Winston writes, "when Mr. Griffith and Mr. Collins came to my house to meet the Prime Minister. It was at a crisis, and the negotiations seemed to hang only by a thread. Griffith went upstairs to parley with Mr. Lloyd George alone. Lord Birkenhead and I were left with Michael Collins meanwhile. He was in his most difficult mood, full of reproaches and defiances, and it was very easy for every one to lose his temper.

'"'You hunted me night and day,' he exclaimed. 'You put a price on my head.'

'"'Wait a minute,' I said. 'You are not the only one.' And I took from my wall the framed copy of the reward offered for my recapture by the Boers. 'At any rate it was a good price—£5000. Look at me—£25 dead or alive. How would you like that?' Actually no such reward had ever been offered for Collins by the British Government, but this I did not know at the time.

'"He read the paper, and as he took it in he broke into a hearty laugh. All his irritation vanished. We had a really serviceable conversation, and thereafter—though I must admit that deep in my heart there was a certain gulf between us—we never to the best of my belief lost the basis of a common understanding."'[1]

The Church and the World.

'As Christ's purpose was to found a Kingdom, so we should think of the Church as the army of that Kingdom. It is, no doubt, true that we have repeatedly substituted compromise for warfare and prudence for the spirit of adventure. The world in which the Church is set to work has, over and over again, made terms with it, which the Church of that period has most wrongly accepted. One of the commonest of the compromises that have been made is for the world to allow the Church to be at peace in proclaiming what may be called its philosophical paradoxes provided that it keeps quiet about its moral ones. And to some extent we have to confess that the Church, as we ourselves constitute it, has fallen into the snare. We have shown, no doubt, a disproportion of concern about the distinctive philosophical doctrines of Christianity as compared with the moral duties of all disciples of Christ. We have, for example, been much more silent than we ought concerning Christ's perfectly plain teaching on the subject of wealth and poverty.'[2]

[1] L. Broad, *Winston Churchill*, 185.
[2] Sidney Dark, *The People's Archbishop*, 57.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.